Class 338.01P Book BS71
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

A. SMITH, BINDER

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/oecumenicaldocum0000ther

THE OECUMENICAL DOCUMENTS OF THE FAITH

ΥΠΟΤΥΠΩΣΙΝ ΕΧΕ ΥΓΙΑΙΝΟΝΤΩΝ ΛΟΓΩΝ

THE

OECUMENICAL DOCUMENTS OF THE FAITH

THE CREED OF NICAEA. THREE EPISTLES OF CYRIL
THE TOME OF LEO. THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES BY

T. HERBERT BINDLEY, B.D.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD
PRINCIPAL OF CODRINGTON COLLEGE AND CANON OF BARBADOS, AND
SOMETIME EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD BISHOP

METHUEN & CO.
36 ESSEX STREET, W.C.
LONDON
1899

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

PLYMOUTH
W. BRENDON AND SON
PRINTERS

PREFACE

A Creed is the outward verbal expression of an inwardly existing Faith, and Faith is a spiritual energy which sympathetically welcomes a revealed Truth. The revelation of the Truth in the Person of the Incarnate Son of God is a historic fact. Its firm outlines have been preserved in the Creeds of the Church; its limitless embrace is beyond the powers of fallen man; yet each age of reverent scrutiny on the part of the regenerate has added something to the apprehension of its breadth and length and depth and height.

*   *   *   *   *

The aim of the present volume is more simple. It is to present the original texts of the outlines of the Church's teaching, and to endeavour to elucidate them by means of historical and dogmatic annotations.

*   *   *   *   *

Any editor of well-known documents must necessarily be under great obligations to those who have worked and edited before him, and I wish to take this opportunity

of making the fullest acknowledgment of my own indebtedness in this respect. My thanks are also due to the editor of the *Church Quarterly Review* for allowing me to reproduce, in the notes upon the Revised Creed of Jerusalem (pages 70–76), some of the arguments and language which I had used in an article which appeared in that Review in April, 1899 (vol. xlviii. 190).

T. H. B.

CLIFTON,
Festival of St. Michael and All Angels,
1899.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
THE CREED OF NICAEA	11
Introduction	13
Text	17
Notes	19
Appendices to Creed of Nicaea	55
Creed of Caesarea	57
Creed of Jerusalem	58
Creed of Alexandria	59
Creed of Justin Martyr	60
Creed of Apostolic Constitutions	61
Creeds of Antioch	63
Revised Creed of Jerusalem	69
History	70
Notes	76
Detached note on "Filioque"	88
Creeds of Epiphanius	93
THE EPISTLES OF CYRIL	97
Introduction	99
Analysis of Second Epistle to Nestorius	102
Text of Second Epistle to Nestorius	104
Notes	108
Third Epistle to Nestorius	116
Analysis	117
Text	121
Notes	134
The Twelve Articles	143
Epistle to John of Antioch	160
Analysis	164
Text	166
Notes	173
Appendix	177

	PAGE
THE TOME OF LEO	187
Introduction	189
Analysis	193
Text	195
Notes	205
THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION OF THE FAITH	217
Introduction	219
Analysis	225
Text	229
Notes	235
Appendix	245
TRANSLATIONS	251
Epistles of Cyril—	
Second to Nestorius	253
Third to Nestorius	258
To John of Antioch	272
The Tome of Leo	279
The Chalcedonian Definition of the Faith	292
GENERAL INDEX	299
INDEX OF TEXTS	308

THE OECUMENICAL DOCUMENTS OF THE FAITH

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

There are two avenues by which we may approach the documents which enshrine the Faith of the Catholic Church—the one purely dogmatic, the other historical. In the one case we deal simply with finished results, technical statements of Catholic truth; in the other we investigate the causes which led to the truth being expressed in the particular language of the formularies before us. But it is indeed really necessary to combine the historical with the dogmatic study of the great symbols of the Faith if we wish to properly appreciate their significance; for the exact terminology of the Creeds and their allied documents cannot be fully understood unless the history embedded in the phrases be known. In some instances this involves a knowledge of the heresies whose false or imperfect presentation of doctrine caused certain truths to be formulated by the Church in terms which at the same time excluded certain errors. This is only to say that, while the truths were undoubtedly held from the beginning, they were often latent in the Christian consciousness rather than verbally expressed, until the denial of them obliged the Church to

ponder upon her Faith, and to put it into reasoned words. And the finished dogmatic results, as we now know them, were not attained without much sifting of language and disentanglement of logic.

For example, it was not until Sabellianism attacked the Tri-personality of the Godhead, extending the unity of nature into a unity of person, that the Church found it necessary to co-ordinate her belief in the Deity of the Son and of the Spirit with her intellectual hold upon monotheism. Nor was it until Arius rationalistically denied the Eternal Divinity of the Word that she had to discover terms to express her faith in the Essential Unity of the Father and the Son existing in personal distinctness. Similarly it was due to the attacks of Apollinarius, Nestorius, and Eutyches upon the completeness of either the Humanity or the Divinity of her Lord that the Church was led to work out the right expression of her belief in the Two Perfect Natures united in His One Divine Personality.

The Baptismal Formula was unquestionably recognized by the Church as the "Hypotype" (ὑποτύπωσις)—the outline of essential credenda—which was to be filled out and enriched as necessity arose.* "Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into

THE NAME OF
THE FATHER AND
THE SON AND
THE HOLY SPIRIT" (Matt. xxviii. 19).

This doctrine of the One God existing in Three Persons is the basis of all Christian creeds, although the several

* Comp. Vincent Ler. Common. 23.

acts and operations of each Person may not be in all cases described. This fact is recognized in the summary explanation of his creed appended to it by Eusebius of Cæsarea at the Nicene Council: *Τούτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύοντες, Πατέρα ἀληθῶς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν ἀληθῶς Υἱὸν, καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἀληθῶς Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· καθῶς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς εἶπεν, κ.τ.λ.* [Matt. xxviii. 19]. Similarly the second creed of Sirmium (Socr. ii. 30): Τὸ *δὲ κεφάλαιον πάσης τῆς πίστεως καὶ ὁ βεβαιότης ἐστὶν ἵνα* Τριὰς *ἀεὶ φυλάττηται, καθῶς ἀνέγνωμεν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* [Matt. xxviii. 19]; the Homoion Creed of Acacius at Seleucia (Socr. ii. 40); and the Synodal letter of Constantinople, 382, which recognizes the Nicene Creed as "an expansion of the baptismal profession" (Theodor. H.E. v. 9). Epiphanius likewise argues the "Unity in Trinity and Trinity in Unity" from the triple assertion of belief in the creed: *πιστεύομεν γὰρ εἰς ἕνα* Θεὸν Πατέρα *παντοκράτορα.* Τὸ *δὲ πιστεύομεν, οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλ' ἡ πίστις εἰς τὸν Θεόν.* Καὶ *εἰς ἕνα* Κ. Ἰ. Χριστόν· *οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλ' εἰς* Θεὸν *ἡ πίστις.* Καὶ *εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον* Πνεῦμα· *καὶ οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἴρηται· ἀλλ' εἰς μίαν δοξολογίαν, καὶ εἰς μίαν ἕνωσιν θεότητος, καὶ μίαν ὁμοουσιότητα, εἰς τρία τέλεια, μίαν δὲ θεότητα, μίαν οὐσίαν, μίαν δοξολογίαν, μίαν κυριότητα, ἀπὸ τοῦ πιστεύομεν, καὶ πιστεύομεν, καὶ πιστεύομεν* (Haer. 74. 14). *

Accordingly we find that the actual interrogations and responses made at baptism seldom embrace more than a belief in the Three Persons of the Trinity, to which was sometimes added a reference to Baptism, Forgiveness of Sins, Eternal Life, and the Church.

* Comp. Basil. de Sp. Sanct. 26, 27; Athan. ad Afros, 11.

Thus the baptismal profession mentioned by Cyril as in use at Jerusalem was simply

πιστεύω εἰς τὸν Πατέρα
καὶ εἰς τὸν Υἱόν
καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνευμα

(Catech. xix. 9), to which he adds in another place

καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας.

(*ib.* xx. 4.) With this may be compared Tertullian's words (de coron. 3), "Dehinc ter mergitamur amplius aliquid respondentes quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit": upon which light is perhaps thrown by his treatise "de baptismo," cap. 11, and by Cyprian's Epistles on the Novatian controversy (Epist. 69 ad Magn.; 70 ad Episc. Num.), from which we may deduce the following baptismal interrogatories:—

Credis in Deum Patrem
et in Filium Christum
et in Spiritum Sanctum?
Credis in remissionem peccatorum
et vitam aeternam per sanctam ecclesiam?

The same evidence is found in a passage in the work *de Trinitate*, which Vigilius of Thapsus probably took from Athanasius: "Confessio fidei immo ipsa fides sanctorum et testamentum quod disposuimus ad Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, ad sacrum lavacrum regenerationis venientes, confessi sic

Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem
et in Jesum Christum Filium Ejus Unigenitum
et Spiritum Sanctum."

Yet these brief confessions, which formed the "Symbolum" proper, by no means exhausted the subject-matter

of the Faith which was taught to the catechumens during their preparation for baptism. We may gather from Cyril's lectures that their instruction embraced two kinds of teaching. First, a large body of Church doctrine on such subjects as the Being of God, Christ, the Incarnation (the Virgin-birth, the Cross, the Burial, the Resurrection, the Ascension), the Future Judgment, the Holy Spirit, the Soul of man, his Body (Marriage, Food, Fasting, Dress), its Resurrection, the Laver of Baptism, and Holy Scripture (Catech. iv.). This teaching formed the Apostolical Tradition, the Canon of the Truth, or Rule of Faith,* and naturally varied in its form and language. Secondly, the candidates were taught the exact words of the local creed of their Church, which was to be committed to memory, and neither to be written down nor recited in the presence of the unbaptized (Cyr. Catech. v. 12; Ruffin. in Symb. Ap. 2).

The authors of the Oecumenical Documents of the fourth and fifth centuries were chiefly concerned to express in unmistakable language the respective truths of the Tri-personality of the One Godhead; the true Deity of the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity; the complete and permanent Humanity united to the complete and permanent Deity of the One Christ. These truths were educed from the Church's conscious faith as it faced the false teaching of various heretical leaders. Five typical forms of doctrinal error are more particularly dealt with in these documents—the Arian, Macedonian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian—to our survey of

* In the notes and introductions which follow, the word "creed" is used somewhat elastically to designate the *regula fidei* as given, *e.g.*, by Irenaeus and Tertullian, which obviously was not couched in precise and unvarying terms, as well as the creeds proper of local churches and of councils.

which a sixth may be prefixed—the Sabellian—as in one sense preparatory to the Arian in the region of speculative theology. Of these heresies, the Sabellian, Arian, and Macedonian were mainly Trinitarian, and the last three mainly Christological.*

To justify this broad classification, it will be convenient to here briefly indicate the characteristic points of each of these heresies, leaving the more detailed examination of them for the notes.

Sabellianism confused the distinction of the Persons in the Godhead. Arianism separated the essential unity of the First and Second Persons. Macedonianism was an extension to the Third Person of the same question which Arianism had raised with respect to the real Deity of the Second.

Apollinarianism, although really a recoil from the Arian disparagement of the Divinity of Christ, started (quod minime reris) from the Arian tenet which denied that Christ possessed a human soul. Nestorianism practically ascribed to Christ two Persons—a Divine and a Human—regarding Him as a mere man advanced in a transcending degree by union with the Son of God. Eutychianism acknowledged in Christ only one Nature—the Divine.

Thus, "theologically," Sabellianism "confounded the Persons," and Arianism and Macedonianism "divided the substance"; while Christologically, Sabellianism, Arianism, and Nestorianism issued practically in Psilanthropism; and Apollinarianism and Eutychianism were ultimately Docetic. More particularly—Arius impugned the co-

* Germs of quasi-Sabellianism are indeed found as early as the time of Justin Martyr (dial. 128), and Arianism did from the first trench upon Christology, since it denied the perfect Humanity of Christ.

essential Deity and the Perfect Manhood of our Lord; Apollinarius attempted to rescue His Divinity at the expense of His Humanity; Nestorius assailed His One Divine Personality; Eutyches eliminated His Human Nature.

This resilience from an exaggerated insistence upon one aspect to an equally exaggerated insistence upon another aspect of the mysterious unions of the Three Divine Persons in the One Essence of the Deity, and of the Two Natures in the One Divine Person of Christ, sprang from the positive rather than from the negative character of each heresy in turn. The strict function of heresy is not to deny. Heresy is the self-willed choice (αἵρεσις) of a particular mode of thought which impairs the fulness of the Truth handed down by the Church from the first.* Each heresy affirmed some one side of Truth; the heresy lay in exaggerating it out of due proportion to, or to the entire exclusion of, the complementary truths of the Faith. The undue insistence upon one side of a doctrine led to the overlooking and ignoring of another equally important presentation of a complementary article of faith, and when this neglect was perceived the disregarded truth was again brought forward, forced into prominence, and exaggerated into a corresponding and antithetic heresy.

Sabellianism, for instance, rightly emphasized the Unity (μοναρχία), but wrongly denied the Tri-personality of the Deity. Arianism laid stress upon the real Sonship, but ignored the co-essential Deity of the Word. Macedonianism maintained the temporal ministry of the Spirit, but rejected His eternal Deity. Apollinarianism passionately

* Tertullian de praescr. haer., 6.

affirmed the Perfect Divinity of Christ, but gave up His complete Humanity. Nestorianism reaffirmed the complete Humanity, but rejected the Personal Divinity. Eutychianism held to the Personal Divinity, but gave up the real Manhood.

It was this unbalanced onesidedness of heresy that made possible that subtle sympathy which has often been remarked as existing between even those doctrinal errors which were apparently diametrically opposed. Heresies may have been mutually exclusive historically without being so philosophically. It was not impossible for a Sabellian to pass over without difficulty to the Arian position, for both alike held that God was Uni-personal and Christ a creature.* Arius and Apollinarius each regarded the Logos as occupying the place of Christ's human soul; and on this point both were Docetic. Nestorius was a Pelagian—"bad Christology leading to bad anthropology," or *vice versa*; † while he also had points of affinity with Sabellianism.‡ Nestorius and Eutyches both recognized, the one actually and the other verbally, a pre-existence of Christ's Manhood before its union with the Son of God. The term "Theotokos" refuted Nestorianism directly, but it also excluded Eutychianism, whose Christ was neither Divine nor Human, but a fusion of Divinity and Humanity which in

* The Priscillianists, for example, held Sabellian and Arian tenets simultaneously; Leo Epist. 15 ad Turrib.

† Cp. Bright, *Waymarks of Church History*, p. 127; and a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*, xvi. 298. Pelagianism and Nestorianism were condemned together at Ephesus (Canons 1 and 4). Curiously enough, Nestorian and Pelagian views were again united in the teaching of some Anabaptists at the Reformation. See the tenets of John Denke in Ranke, *Reform.* iii. 559; Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 85.

‡ See the note on Cyril's Anathema V.

reality was neither. Not seldom too the words of an early writer like Ignatius or Tertullian,* and particularly those of Athanasius, and even of Cyril, will be found to have anticipatorily guarded against later heresies in language designed to counteract earlier ones.†

There is also another point of view from which these heresies may be studied. All sprang from a common groundwork of mistaken reverence for the Divine honour. Sabellius feared to impair the Divine Monarchia by admitting a distinction of Persons. Arius feared to dishonour the Paternal Fount of Deity by allowing to the Son co-essentiality with the Father. Apollinarius thought it derogatory to the Son of God to unite to Himself a human soul (and body). Nestorius shrank from the humiliation implied in the human birth of One Who was Personally God.‡ Eutyches declined to grant to a Human Nature its complete integrity in union with the transcending nature of the Godhead.§

This pseudo-reverential temper|| may be traced to two causes. It was partly the result of a fusion of Oriental

* Instances are given in the notes, but see especially Ignat. Eph. 7, and Tertullian's treatises "adversus Praxean," and "de carne Christi."

† See *e.g.* Athanasius, de Inc. Verbi D. 17; Orat. c. Arian. ii. 10; iii. 31, 43; ad Max. 3; contr. Apollin. i. 10 (Eutychianism); Orat. c. Arian. i. 45; ii. 8; iii. 30 (Nestorianism); Epist. ad Adelph. and Epist. ad Epict. (Nestorianism and Eutychianism); comp. Leo Epist. 109, and Epist. of Chalc. Council to Marcian, Mansi, vii. 464. Cyril Epist. ad Joan. (Eutychianism).

‡ See Cyril contr. Nest. iv. 5, where he attributes to him an excessive *εὐλάβεια* on this very ground.

§ Similarly Gnosticism repudiated the Incarnation as incompatible with the nature of the Supreme, and regarded Sacraments as unworthy channels of Divine grace. Irenaeus i. 14, 3.

|| "Irreligiosa de Deo sollicitudo," as Hilary calls it, de Trin. iv. 6.

philosophy with Christian dogmata, issuing in Docetic and Manichaean notions which regarded matter as inherently evil,* and consequently as something with which the Deity could not worthily come in contact. It was due also to that natural human pride or selfwill which refuses to receive a revelation of the Divine Nature or mode of working which does not accord with its own predetermined theories. It is to this latter rationalizing spirit of intellectual haughtiness that Arianism, Nestorianism, and Pelagianism must be chiefly referred, while Apollinarianism and Eutychianism are better traceable to the former source.

* It was on this ground that the Priscillianists rejected the doctrine of the resurrection of the body—"quia concretio corporis non sit congruens animae dignitati" (Leo Epist. 15 ad Turrib.).

THE CREED OF NICAEA

ΕΠΑΓΩΝΙΖΕΣΘΕ ΤΗ ΑΠΑΞ ΠΑΡΑΔΟΘΕΙΣΗ
ΤΟΙΣ ΑΓΙΟΙΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΙ

THE CREED OF NICAEA

Of the circumstances which led to the Nicene Council and the precise formulation of its Creed it will only be necessary to give a very brief outline.

One day in the year 318 or 319 a discourse was delivered by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, on the great mystery of the Trinity in Unity. Exception was taken to its teaching by one of the Alexandrian clergy named Arius, on the ground that it tended to obliterate the distinction of the Three Persons in the Godhead, and therein savoured of Sabellianism.* Arius proceeded to disseminate his own views, which exaggerated those elements which he conceived to be implied in the Sonship of the Second Person, until he arrived at the point where Sonship was replaced by creatureship, and the co-eternal and co-essential Deity of the Word was surrendered.

After repeated failures to reclaim Arius to orthodoxy, Alexander was obliged to excommunicate him. His party, however, grew in numbers, and a large council was held at Alexandria in 321 which investigated the Arian teaching and condemned it. Meanwhile Arius had found partisans in Nicomedia and in Palestine, whither he had gone after leaving Aegypt. Thence he wrote to

* So Socrates H.E. i. 5; but if Constantine was correctly informed (Epist. to Alexander and Arius apud Socr. i. 7; comp. Sozom. i. 15), it would seem that Arius had already given utterance to his views, and that Alexander submitted a test question to his clergy.

Alexander,* and also popularized his views both in prose and in verse ("Thalia").† Alexander issued an encyclical letter,‡ but the heresy continued to spread in the East. The Emperor Constantine, who naturally underrated the dogmatic importance of the dispute, attempted to allay the trouble by addressing a letter to Arius and Alexander, in which he described the controversy as arising out of foolish speculation on an insignificant matter. This letter was sent by the hand of Hosius of Corduba to Alexandria late in 324. A council was held and Arius again condemned. That the word *ὁμοούσιον* was here debated seems probable, both from Socrates' statement (iii. 7) that Hosius raised a discussion about the terms *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* in order to oppose Sabellianism,§ and also from the fact that the word *ὁμοούσιον* was afterwards strongly insisted upon by the Emperor, doubtless at Hosius' suggestion, in the council of Nicaea.||

Constantine now conceived the idea of summoning a general council of bishops from all parts of the Church, whose duty it should be to settle the question of faith, and two other matters which were disturbing the unity of the Church.¶ It met at Nicaea, in Bithynia, June 19,

* Athanasius de Synodis, 16.

† The "Thalia," or "Banquet," was a collection of songs, dealing with the most sacred mysteries, written in a metre made infamous by its association with the wanton songs of Sotades, the obscene Maronite poet, *cir.* B.C. 280. Socr. i. 9; Athan. Or. c. Ar. i. 2, 4, 5; de syn. 15; Philostorg. ii. 2. Martial, Epigr. vii. 17, terms his own poems "lasciva Thalia."

‡ Socrates i. 6.

§ Socrates' account is not free from confusion; but it is natural to connect this discussion with Hosius' doings in Alexandria.

|| Eusebius-Caes. apud Socr. i. 8.

¶ The Paschal Question and the Meletian schism in Aegypt.

325. Preliminary discussions were held,* in which the Scriptural teaching upon the Word, Wisdom, and Son of God was carefully examined, the chief passages adduced being Proverbs viii. 22; Matt. xix. 17, xx. 23; Mark xiii. 32; Luke ii. 52; John v. 19, x. 30, xiv. 28; Acts ii. 36; 1 Cor. xv. 28; Phil. ii. 7; Coloss. i. 15; Heb. i. 3. Some of the debates are described by Athanasius,† who himself, as Alexander's archdeacon, took a prominent part in them. When it was found that Scriptural terms were accepted in an unreal sense by the Arians, the necessity was clearly forced upon the orthodox of expressing the real sense of Scripture and the true faith of the Church in terms of which the meaning could not be explained away.

Accordingly it was agreed that a dogmatic standard of faith should be adopted. An Arian creed prcduced by Eusebius of Nicomedia was at once rejected for its blasphemy. Then Eusebius of Caesarea produced the ancient creed of his Church, which was perfectly orthodox but not sufficiently technical. This was taken as a base, and amplified by three phrases specially selected as incapable of Arian evasion—*ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός*—*γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα*—*ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί*—and by some others taken or adapted from the creeds of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria.‡ Anathemas were appended condemning various Arian tenets.

Any further remarks upon the phraseology of the creed are reserved for the notes which follow. Meanwhile it is well to observe, first, that the method of the Nicene

* Sozom. i. 17.

† De decretis Nic., Epist. ad Afros., de Synod.

‡ These creeds are printed below in the Appendix to the Nicene Creed, and should be carefully compared with the Nicene and with each other.

Council was one and the same with that of the early dogmatic apologists, namely, the reinforcement of the common tradition of the Church, which had been held from the beginning. The Council added nothing new to the facts of Apostolic belief; it simply restated them in the face of novel opinions, which would have impaired their integrity.* Secondly, what *was* new in connexion with the Council was its adoption of an oecumenical creed, proposed for subscription as a test of orthodoxy. Hitherto the traditional Rule of Faith had been embodied in various local formularies and creeds, catechetical and baptismal, differing verbally in the different Churches. Without interfering with these, there was now for the first time brought into existence one definite standard of right belief accepted by the representatives of the whole of Christendom.

Our knowledge of the exact forms of the local symbols is very imperfect, partly because of the dislike of Church teachers to give in a consecutive order the words of their baptismal symbol, and partly because the importance gained by oecumenical or conciliar creeds pushed the others into the background. The evidence seems to show that there were two methods followed in connexion with the creeds of local Churches after Nicaea. In some cases the Nicene Creed was taken as a basis and expanded in order to meet with more definite language some particular heresy like that of Apollinarius, or Marcellus, or Macedonius; in others the existing local creed was enriched

* Cp. Athan. de synod. 5, of the Nicene Fathers, *ἔγραψαν οὐκ* "Ἔδοξεν" *ἀλλ'* "*Οὕτως πιστεύει ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία,*" *καὶ εὐθὺς ὡμολόγησαν πῶς πιστεύουσιν, ἵνα δείξωσιν ὅτι μὴ νεώτερον ἀλλ' ἀποστολικόν ἐστιν αὐτῶν τὸ φρόνημα, καὶ ἃ ἔγραψαν οὐκ ἐξ αὐτῶν εὑρέθη, ἀλλὰ ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἅπερ ἐδίδαξεν οἱ ἀπόστολοι.*

with Nicene and other phrases. Instances of the former method will be seen in the local creed of Constantinople as represented by the recension of the Nicene incorporated in the Chalcedonian *Definitio Fidei*, and in the longer creed of Epiphanius (Ancor. 119); of the latter, in the revised creeds of Antioch and of Jerusalem (see Append. vi., vii.).

THE CREED OF NICAEA

Πιστεύομεν
εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα
πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν·
καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν
τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ
τοῦτ᾽ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός
Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ,
Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός,
Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί,
δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο
τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ,
τὸν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ
διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, κατελθόντα,
καὶ σαρκωθέντα,
καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
παθόντα
καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς,
ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς
καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας Ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν,
καὶ Πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν,
καὶ ὅτι Ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο,
ἢ Ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι
ἢ κτιστόν
ἢ τρεπτόν
ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

NOTES ON THE CREED OF NICAEA

TEXT. In the lack of any authentic Acts of the Council, the primary authorities for the Text of the Creed are Eusebius of Caesarea and Athanasius. The former embodied the Creed in a letter written to his diocese at the time of the Council which is extant in four recensions:—(1) Appendix to Athan. de decr. syn. Nic.; (2) Socrates H.E. i. 8; (3) Theodoret H.E. i. 12; (4) Gelasius Hist. Conc. Nic. ii. 35, this last possessing no independent value. The first three are referred to below as E^A, E^S, E^T.

Athanasius himself gave the Text of the Creed in his letter to Jovian 3 (Bened. ed. i. 239), which is also inserted by Theodoret in his history, iv. 3. Other authorities are Socrates i. 8, Basil Epist. 125, Cyril of Alex. Epist. 3 ad Nest., and a document presented by Eustathius of Sebaste and others to Liberius in 365, apud Socr. iv. 12. These are referred to respectively as A, S, B, C, Eust.

None of the variations are important, but it may be well to note them at once.

Line 4 εἰς ἕνα μονογενῆ Θεὸν K.'I. X. *Eust.*
6 *omit* μονογενῆ *Eust.*
9 καὶ φῶς ἐκ φ. *S.* E^T.
14 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς *A, Eust.*
15 *omit* τὸν *S.*
18 *omit* καὶ E^S, *A, B.*
21 *omit* τοὺς *C, Eust.*

22 *καὶ πάλιν ἐρχ.* *C.*
23 τὸ Π. τὸ Ἅγ. *E*[S].
29 *omit ἢ κτιστόν* *C, E*[T], *Eust.*
32 *omit τούτους* *S, E*[T].
omit ἁγία *C, E*[SA], *Eust.*
omit καὶ ἀποστολική *E*[A].

On the variations in the Text read in the Council of Chalcedon see below page 236.

Πιστεύομεν. Conciliar Creeds were naturally couched in the plural number, and Baptismal Creeds, as naturally, in the singular: Cyr. Jer. Catech. xix. 9; xx. 4. The latter was the general cast of Western Creeds, the forms given by Irenaeus iii. 4, 1, and by Tertullian, adv. Prax. 2, being apparent exceptions. Some of the Liturgical Eastern Creeds are likewise in the singular number; *e.g.* Apost. Const. vii. 41; Lit. of St. James (πιστεύω), Brightman, East. Lit. p. 42; Lit. of Syr. Jacobites (Priest, "We believe"; congregation, "I believe"), *ib.* p. 82; Lit. of St. Mark (πιστεύω), *ib.* p. 124; Ninth Cent. Byz. Lit. (πιστεύω), *ib.* p. 321; and this use has asserted itself in the modern Greek Orthodox Church. In Augustine the form varies. The Creed commented on *de fid. et symb.* was seemingly in the plural; that in Serm. ad Catech., § 2, "credo," but § 3, "credimus."

The plural number witnesses to the Church's corporate unity, to unselfishness in the Faith, and to the brotherhood of the saints. Nor is this feeling wholly absent from those Creeds which begin with the first person singular, for the plural number generally appears in the second article ("Jesus Christ *our* Lord"), where from the opening word we should naturally have expected

"my" and not "our." The sentiment finds its highest expression in the Paternoster, Πάτερ ἡμῶν.

Πίστις, faith, belief, is a correspondence with the unseen, an unfaltering sense of confidence in its object. It is that which endures as seeing the invisible One (Heb. xi. 1, 27). Faith is therefore primarily a spiritual and moral energy, not an intellectual one.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς. The preposition adds a further force to the idea of belief, and expresses the transference of confidence and devotion from self to God. The distinction between πιστεύειν and πιστεύειν εἰς is well expressed by Augustine, Tract. xxix. in Ioan. 6: "Hoc est opus Dei ut credatis in Eum quem Ille misit. Ut credatis in Eum, non ut credatis Ei. Sed si credatis in Eum, credatis Ei: non autem continuo qui credit Ei, credit in Eum. Nam et daemones credebant Ei, non credebant in Eum. Rursus etiam de apostolis Ipsius possumus dicere: credimus Paulo, sed non credimus in Paulum; credimus Petro, sed non credimus in Petrum. Quid est ergo credere in Eum? Credendo amare, credendo diligere, credendo in Eum ire et Ejus membris incorporari." Comp. Tract. liv. 3, and pseudo-August. Serm. 181 de tempore: "Non dicit, Credo Deum, vel credo Deo, quamvis et haec saluti necessari sint. Aliud enim est credere Illi, aliud credere Illum, aliud credere in Illum. Crederi Illi est credere vera esse quæ loquitur: credere Illum, credere quia Ipse est Deus: credere in Illum, diligere Illum."

Pearson ascribed this distinction to Augustine, but overlooked the fact that Augustine found it already drawn in St. John. Indeed the difference between πιστεύειν εἰς (ἐπὶ c. accus.) and π. c. dat., though

especially marked in St. John, is clearly observed throughout the New Testament (see John vi. 29, 30; 1 John v. 10; Acts x. 43, xvi. 31, xxvi. 27, xxvii. 25; Gal. ii. 16; Phil. i. 29; 1 Pet. i. 8). It is justifiable therefore to insist upon its full force here, notwithstanding that it was not always observed in the phraseology of the early creeds, whether Greek or Latin.

2 *ἕνα Θεόν.* Emphasis is laid on the Unity of God in all creeds which were in use where philosophical speculation or Gnostic heresy denied the unity of the First Principle: Gaul (Iren. i. 10, 1, iii. 4, 1, iv. 33, 7), Carthage (Tertullian de virg. vel. 1, adv. Prax. 2, de praescr. haer. 13 [not Cyprian]), the East (Origen de princ. i. praef., Lucian apud Socr. H.E. ii. 10, Euseb.-Caes. *ib.* i. 8, Cyr.-Jer. Catech. vi., vii., 1 [but not xix. 9, Bapt. Creed]). Scriptural authority is particularly explicit on this point; Deut. iv. 35, vi. 4; Isaiah xliv. 6, 8; 1 Cor. viii. 4 f.; Eph. iv. 6. Ruffinus is no doubt right in tracing the phrases ἕνα Θεόν . . . ἕνα Κ. Ἰ. Χ., to St. Paul's words, 1 Cor. viii. 6. "Orientales ecclesiae omnes paene ita tradunt Credo in *Uno* Deo Patre et rursus in sequenti sermone ubi nos dicimus Et in Christo Jesu unico Filio Ejus Domino nostro, illi tradunt Et in *Uno* Domino nostro . . . Unum scilicet Deum et Unum Dominum, secundum auctoritatem Pauli Apostoli profitentes" (Ruff. in symb. 4). But the recurrence of the numeral again before "Holy Spirit" in the third division of some early creeds, *e.g.* those of Caesarea, Jerusalem, Alexandria, seems rather to show that the purport of its insertion in each case was to mark the distinctness of the Three Persons in the Godhead; indeed Eusebius' own words in the anti-Sabellian appendix to his creed imply this (see them cited page 3).

The doctrine of the Unity of God, although a majestic contribution to the purity of religion, was not the final revelation of the Nature of the Deity.

2 Πατέρα. Comp. Eph. iv. 6, εἷς Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, 1 Cor. viii. 6, εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ. With the exception of the creeds of Marcellus (apud Epiphan. Haer. 72) and Tertullian (in all three forms), this word is found in this position in all creeds. Yet the idea of Fatherhood is implied even in those creeds which omit the word, by the use of such phrases as τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, Filius ejus, Dei Filius, in the following section. It is indeed primarily in relation to the Son that the First Person in the Trinity is termed "Father" in the creeds. But inasmuch as the Fatherhood is archetypal (Eph. iii. 15), we need not exclude the thought of God's Fatherly relation to all creation (ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, 1 Cor. viii. 6; cp. Creed of Antioch), and, in an especial sense, to believers as His adopted sons; Rom. viii. 15; John xx. 17; 1 John iii. 1.

2 παντοκράτορα. "All sovereign." The word asserts the universal dominion of God, and is inadequately represented by "omnipotens," "almighty," in the Latin and English creeds.

παντοκράτωρ belongs to Biblical Greek, and is used in the versions to translate both צבאות "(Lord of) Hosts," and שַׁדַּי, "Almighty," 2 Sam. v. 10, vii. 8, 26, etc.; Job v. 17, viii. 5. In the N.T. it is used only by St. John (nine times in the Apocalypse), but appears 2 Cor. vi. 18 in a quotation from the LXX. which is difficult to trace (perhaps 2 Sam. vii. 8). It invests the idea of God with a spiritual and moral, not a metaphysical, significance.

Comp. Cyr.-Jer. Catech. viii. 3, *παντοκράτωρ γὰρ ἐστὶν, ὁ πάντων κρατῶν, ὁ πάντων ἐξουσιάζων.* Theoph. ad Autol. i. 4; Greg. Nyss. contr. Eunom. ii. Ruffin. in symb. 5; Novatian de Trin. 2. A similar and nearly equivalent phrase, "Rex saeculorum" (= *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων* of 1 Tim. i. 17), occurs in a creed of pseudo-Augustine (Serm. in redd. symb. 215: Hahn Bibl. d. Symb. p. 58) and of Fulgentius of Ruspe (Hahn, p. 61).

3 *πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν.* The emphatic *ἁπάντων* of the Caesarean Creed ("which might imply the creation of the Son and the Holy Spirit") is here altered into *πάντων*; nor does *ἁπάντων* in this connexion occur elsewhere except in the Creed of the Apostolic Constitutions vii. 41, the confession of Adamantius (Hahn, p. 18), and the Creed of Charisius of Philadelphia, Conc. Ephes. Act. vi., Mansi, iv. 1361 (Hahn, p. 318): but comp. Hippol. Philosoph. x. 32, *ἁπάντων ποιητὴς καὶ κύριος.*

This clause is characteristically Eastern. It was the tendency of Oriental mysticism to lay exaggerated stress on the position and functions of unseen spiritual powers, and it was therefore necessary to assert their dependence upon the First Principle. Especially did the dualistic theories, which constantly troubled the East, and penetrated the West (Gaul and Africa), in the form of Gnostic heresies which separated the Supreme God from the Creator of the world, necessitate the insertion of some words in the creeds to identify the Creator or Demiurge with the One God. See the forms given by Irenaeus i. 10. 1, *τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς*: iii. 4. 1, factorem (al. fabricatorem) caeli et terrae et omnium quae in eis sunt;

and Tertullian de praescr. haer. 13, de virg. veland. 1, mundi creatorem. Similarly the early Jerusalem Creed, *ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς*, whence it passed into the Epiphanian and later forms, but did not establish itself in the Western creeds until the seventh century. Comp. Origen, c. Cels. i. 25, *ἢ γὰρ ἀορίστως ὁμολογοῦσιν τὸ κοινὸν ὄνομα, τὸ, ὁ Θεὸς, ἢ καὶ μετὰ προσθήκης τῆς, ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ὅλων, ὁ ποιητὴς οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς*—words which seem to point to such a clause in the Creed of Alexandria (see below, page 59).

Creation is here attributed to the Father as the sole Source and End of all finite being: 1 Cor. viii. 6, *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα*. The true doctrine of creation was expressed by Athanasius de Inc. V.D. 3, where he cites Past. Herm. 1, Heb. xi. 3, and adds *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὰ πάντα ὁ Θεὸς πεποίηκεν διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου Λόγου* (see below on *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο*).

4 *καί*. The conjunction is significant. The same belief is professed in the Second Person as in the First; and so again below, *καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγ. Πνεῦμα*. Comp. John xiv. 1, *πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε*. So Hilary *de Trin.* ix. 19, "Believe in God and believe in Me."

4 *ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*. Εἷς Κύριος comes from Ephes. iv. 5; the whole phrase from 1 Cor. viii. 6. This is the historic title borne by the Second Person of the Trinity, Incarnate. In contains three appellatives:—

(1) Κύριος = יהוה. Comp. John viii. 58 with Exod. iii. 14; Luke ii. 11, *Σωτὴρ ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς Κύριος*: Acts x. 36, *Οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων Κύριος*: Rom. x. 9–13 with Joel ii. 32; and Psalm xxxiv. 9 with 1 Peter ii. 3, although Hort (*ad loc.*) does not think that any "such

identification [of Jehovah with Christ] can be clearly made out in the N.T."

(2) Ἰησοῦς = יהשׁע, God the Saviour, the Divine Man, Salvator Mundi. Luke i. 31, ii. 21; Matt. i. 21.

(3) Χριστός = משׁיח, the Anointed; the Fulfiller primarily of Jewish national expectations and prophecy, and, through these, of all Gentile longings and aspirations. John i. 41, iv. 25; Luke ii. 32; Rom. xv. 8–12.

5 *τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ.* The phrase is verbally identical with that of Nathanael (John i. 49) and of Martha (John xi. 27). Comp. Luke i. 35; Hebr. i. 5; John xx. 31; Matt. i. 20.

The fact of the Divine Sonship stands prominently forward, *τὸν Υἱόν* replacing *τὸν Λόγον* of the Caesarean Creed. This is the case in nearly all creeds, and in view of the Arian tenet it would naturally be insisted on by the orthodox at Nicaea.

6 *γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός.* This clause is taken from the Alexandrian, Antiochene, and Jerusalem creeds, all of which add, with the Caesarean (which read *γεγεννημένον*), *πρὸ* [*πάντων τῶν*] *αἰώνων.* These last words were probably omitted here for the sake of grammatical clearness. They retained their natural place in the revised Jerusalem Creed,* which followed a different construction from the Nicene. They witness to the Eternal Generation of the Son, but the expression is not Scriptural. Our Lord's own phrase (John xvii. 5) is *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι*, or (*ib.* 24) *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.*

* Throughout these notes the "revised Jerusalem Creed" denotes the formulary attributed to the One Hundred and Fifty Fathers of Constantinople by the Chalcedonian Council.

The Arians admitted the Son's Generation from the Father, but rejected the logical consequence of this admission in the case of a Generation which was Divine and unique. True Generation from a Divine Being must imply in the One Generated the possession of the same Divine Nature, and the Generation itself must therefore be of an eternal character. Ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός was thus explained and defined as ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας and ὁμοούσιος. See further, on the anathemas. Hilary of Poitiers (de Trin. viii. 13) argued the unity of Nature, as opposed to a mere concord of will, between the Father and the Son, from the unity of all who partake of the Eucharist. This union results (he says) from the Father being in Christ and Christ in us.

6 *μονογενῆ*. On the construction, see the next note. This word emphasizes, not the Generation, but the unique Personal Being of the Son. So it had been used by the Council of Antioch in A.D. 269 in the synodal letter to Paul of Samosata: Τοῦτον δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν γεννητὸν, μονογενῆ Υἱὸν, εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀοράτου Θεοῦ τυγχάνοντα, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, Σοφίαν καὶ Λόγον καὶ Δύναμιν Θεοῦ, πρὸ αἰώνων ὄντα, οὐ προγνώσει ἀλλ' οὐσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει Θεὸν, Θεοῦ Υἱὸν, ἔν τε παλαιᾷ καὶ νέᾳ διαθήκῃ ἐγνωκότες ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ κηρύσσομεν* (apud Hahn, p. 178; Routh Rel. Sacr. ii. 466).

In the Arian controversy the word was not of great dogmatic importance, inasmuch as it was accepted by the Arians and its force evaded by making "generation" practically synonymous with "creation." Nor did the

* A comparison of these terms with Lucian's Creed seems to show that the Council was here using some phrases from the Baptismal Creed of Antioch (see pages 64 foll.).

uniqueness of the Son's Generation exempt Him from "creatureship." See Arius to Eusebius of Nicomedia, apud Theodor. H.E. i., 5 cited below. In the Dated creed and Fraud of Nicé (A.D. 359) *μονογενῆ* is explained by *μόνον ἐκ μόνου*, a direct substitution for the Nicene *τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσιὰς τοῦ Πατρός*.

Instances of the Arian use of *μονογενής* occur in his own letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, *θελήματι καὶ βουλῇ ὑπέστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων πλήρης Θεὸς μονογενὴς ἀναλλοίωτος*: and in his "Blasphemies," apud Athan. de synod. 15, *Λοιπὸν ὁ Υἱὸς οὐκ ὢν (ὑπῆρξε δὲ θελήσει πατρῴᾳ), μονογενὴς Θεός ἐστιν.* It is similarly joined with *Θεός* in the Lucianic (Second Antiochene, "Dedication") Creed; in a creed of Marcellus (apud Euseb. contr. Marc. i. 4), *εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ μονογενῆ Θεόν*: and in precisely identical words in the Creed of Theophronius (Third Antiochene), Athan. de synod. 24. In the Homoion Creed of Acacius at Seleucia the phrase is practically Nicene, *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ μονογενῆ* (Athan. de synod. 29), and so in the profession of Eustathius and other Homoiousians (apud Socr. iv. 12), *εἰς ἕνα μονογενῆ Θεὸν*, K. 'I. X.

As qualifying *Υἱόν* it occurs in the first, fourth, and fifth creeds of the Antiochene series (Athan. de synod. 22 foll., Socr. ii. 10, 18, 19) and in the Sirmian confessions (Socr. ii. 30, 37).

Μονογενής was represented in the Latin creeds by unicus, and so Leo in his Tome, but elsewhere in his writings he employs unigenitus. The old Latin versions give unicus, but the Vulgate has unigenitus, and this form prevailed eventually in the Latin creeds from the fourth century onwards.

7 *τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός.*

The construction of the clauses *γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός, μονογενῆ, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ,* is not free from ambiguity. Hort, after a rigid analysis of the grammar and history, concluded that *μονογενῆ* did "double duty, combined alike with *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός* and with *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ,*" the clause *τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Π.* being parenthetic. "Thus there would be no real pause between the seven words *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ.*" The familiarity of the phrase *μονογενῆς Θεός,* based upon St. John's usage (i. 18), is abundantly proved, but there is also sufficient authority for regarding *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ* as an independent phrase by itself; *e.g.* in the Caesarean Creed of Eusebius, in the Lucianic Creed of Antioch, and in a creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus. (Hahn, p. 254; Mansi, i. 1030.) The parenthesis, if it be a parenthesis, is extremely awkward, and does not appear to have been admitted into any local creed which was expanded by means of Nicene additions.* On the other hand, it is certain from the statements of Eusebius and of Athanasius that the words *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός* were meant to interpret, not *μονογενῆ,* but *γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός.* (Eusebius, apud Socr. i. 8; Athan. de decr. Nic. 19, ad Afros 5.) On the whole, it is perhaps simpler to understand both *μονογενῆ* and *τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός* as explanatory of *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός,* and to take *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ* independently as a fresh clause in apposition with *τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ,* and as adopted from the Caesarean Creed.

ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός was, as we have already remarked, the first of the three crucial phrases which were found by the Council to be imperatively needed to

* Except in the Epiphanian shorter creed.

secure the reality of the Sonship. The incidental accounts which we possess of the course of the debates show that the force of other phrases, whether taken from Scripture or from existing creeds, was evaded by the Arians. None of the phrases were absolutely new ones, as Athanasius pointed out;* *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*, *e.g.*, had been used by Theognostus of Alexandria in his Hypotyposes towards the end of the third century. Eusebius of Nicomedia had distinctly rejected it in his letter to Paulinus of Tyre;† and the Arians generally thought that it subjected God to necessity, but Athanasius showed that *necessity* was not a correct term to use in describing that which was inherent in the *Nature* of God.‡

8 *Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ.* These words, as we have seen, were taken from the Creed of Caesarea. The preposition (*ἐκ*) denotes origin and derivation from the Father as Fons Deitatis. The absolute possession of life from another is the essential character of Sonship; John v. 26; comp. viii. 42, xvi. 28. Augustin. Tract. xlvii. in Ioan. 8, "Ab Illo processit ut Deus, ut aequalis, ut Filius Unicus, ut Verbum Patris." Compare the Valentinian Ptolemaeus on John i. 1 quoted by Irenaeus i. 1. 18 (ed. Harvey), *τὸ ἐκ Θεοῦ γεννηθὲν Θεός ἐστιν.*§

9 *Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός.* Heb. i. 3 naturally suggested the comparison of the simultaneous birth of light and its

* Athan. de decr. Nic. 25; comp. *ib.* 19, ad Afros. 5, de synod. 33 foll., Epist. Euseb. Caes.

† Theodor. H.E. i. 6, *οὐκ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ γεγονός.*

‡ Athan. Orat. iii. 62–66.

§ Mr. Ottley (*The Doctrine of the Incarnation*, i. 291) ascribes these words to Irenaeus himself, but Irenaeus appears to be quoting Ptolemaeus, as the Latin version states.

source with the Eternal Generation of the Son from the Father; and it became a favourite simile with Christian writers. Comp. Origen de princip. iv. 28; Tertull. adv. Prax. 8, 13; Apol. 21 ("lumen de lumine"); Tatian, Orat. 5; Dionysius-Alex. apud Athan. de sent. Dion. 18; Justin Mart. Dial. 128; Athan. de decr. Nic. 23 and 25 (citing Theognostus); Augustin. Serm. ad Catech. 8.

10 *Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ.* This phrase is not traceable in any extant creed previous to Nicaea, but as neither Athanasius nor Eusebius deemed it necessary to defend it as of an especially Nicene character, we may reasonably infer that it was taken from some creed. The words Θεὸν ἀληθινόν actually occur in the early Jerusalem Creed. Athanasius uses the phrase Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, citing 1 John v. 20, Exposit. Fid. 1. Comp. Orat. c. Arian. iii. 9, *ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Πατρὸς ἀληθινόν ἐστι γέννημα*: and again *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός ἐστι φύσει καὶ ἀληθινὸν γέννημα.*

11 *γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα.* This is the second characteristic phrase of the Council; and in defence of it Athanasius (de decr. Nic. 25 foll.) quotes Dionysius of Alexandria and his namesake of Rome as witnesses to the blasphemy of terming the Son a "creature" or a "work." That the Logos was *ποιηθέντα* was the great Arian contention. They ranked Him amongst the creatures of God—*εἷς τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ γενητῶν* (Encycl. of Alexander apud Socrates i. 6). Arius' own words in his letter to Alexander (apud Athan. de synod. 16) were *ὑποστήσαντα ἰδίῳ θελήματι ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, κτίσμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τέλειον ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων.* But the words *ἰδίῳ θελήματι* rob the con-

cession of *ἄτρεπτον* of its value (see below on *τρεπτόν*), while *οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων* is a refinement which yet does not remove the Logos from the category of beings separate from the Father's nature.

12 *ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί.* This, the third crucial phrase, was selected by the Council as concentrating in itself the force of various Scriptural expressions which denoted the real Godhead of the Son. It had in fact been disowned by Eusebius of Nicomedia on the very ground that it implied the true Sonship; Ambros. de fid. iii. 15, § 125, "Nam quid est aliud cur *ὁμοούσιον* Patri nolint [Ariani] Filium dici nisi quia nolunt verum Dei Filium confiteri? sicut auctor ipsorum Eusebius Nicomediensis epistula sua prodidit scribens: Si verum, inquit, Dei Filium et increatum dicimus, *ὁμοούσιον* cum Patre incipimus confiteri. Haec cum lecta esset epistula in concilio Nicaeno, hoc verbum in tractatu fidei posuerunt patres, quia id viderunt adversariis esse formidine; ut tamquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio ipsorum nefandae caput haereseos amputarent." Arius himself had also expressly rejected the term in his "Thalia," *οὐδε γάρ ἐστιν ἴσος ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὁμοούσιος* [*Πατρί*] (apud Athan. de synod. 15). Athanasius' account of the reasons for its adoption are given de decr. Nic. 18 foll., ad Afros 6, de synod. 45; and the following extracts will be sufficient to illustrate his position with regard to it: *εἰ καὶ μὴ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἰσιν αἱ λέξεις ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν διάνοιαν ἔχουσιν* (de decr. Nic. 21): a little before he had said *ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡ ἐκ Πατρὸς τοῦ Υἱοῦ γέννησις ἄλλη παρὰ τὴν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐ μόνον ὅμοιος ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀδαίρετός ἐστι τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας, καὶ ἓν μέν εἰσιν αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ὡς αὐτὸς εἴρηκεν, ἀεὶ δὲ ἐν τῷ Πατρί*

ἐστιν ὁ Λόγος καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ, ὡς ἔστιν τὸ ἀπαύγασμα πρὸς τὸ φῶς· τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἡ λέξις σημαίνει. διὰ τοῦτο ἡ σύνοδος τοῦτο νοοῦσα καλῶς ὁμοούσιον ἔγραψαν ἵνα δείξωσιν ἄλλον εἶναι τῶν γενητῶν τὸν Λογον. Then in *ib.* 25 he cites Dionysius of Alexandria as having admitted the use of the term. Again, ad Afros 6, ἐνταῦθα οἱ ἐπίσκοποι συνήγαγεν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν τὸ ἀπαύγασμα, τήν τε πηγὴν καὶ τὸν ποταμὸν, καὶ τὸν χαρακτῆρα πρὸς τὴν ὑπόστασιν, καὶ τὸ, Ἐν τῷ φωτί σου ὄψομεθα φῶς, καὶ τὸ, Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν· καὶ λευκότερον λοιπὸν καὶ συντόμως ἔγραψαν ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Υἱόν· τὰ γὰρ προειρημένα πάντα ταύτην ἔχει τὴν σημασίαν. In the de synod. 45 he defends its Nicene use against the Arian objection that it had been rejected as Sabellian by the Antiochene Fathers in 269. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸν Σαμοσατέα καθελόντες, σωματικῶς ἐκλαμβάνοντες τὸ ὁμοούσιον, τοῦ Παύλου σοφίζεσθαί τε θέλοντος καὶ λέγοντος Εἰ μὴ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου γέγονεν ὁ Χριστὸς Θεός, οὐκοῦν ὁμοούσιός ἐστι τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ἀνάγκη τρεῖς οὐσίας εἶναι, μίαν μὲν προηγουμένην, τὰς δὲ δύο ἐξ ἐκείνης· διᾶ τοῦτ᾽ εἰκότως εὐλαβηθέντες τὸ τοιοῦτον σόφισμα τοῦ Σαμοσατέως εἰρήκασι Μὴ εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοούσιον· οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ οὕτως ὁ Υἱὸς πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἐνόει. Οἱ δὲ τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν ἀναθεματίσαντες, θεωρήσαντες τὴν πανουργίαν τοῦ Παύλου, καὶ λογισάμενοι μὴ οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσωμάτων καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ Θεοῦ, τὸ ὁμοούσιον σημαίνεσθαι, γινώσκοντές τε μὴ κτίσμα, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας γέννημα εἶναι τὸν Λόγον, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀρχὴν καὶ ῥίζαν καὶ πηγὴν εἶναι τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ αὐτοαληθὴς ὁμοιότης ἦν τοῦ γεννήσαντος . . . τούτου ἕνεκεν εἰκότως εἰρήκασι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν Υἱόν.*

* Comp. Basil contr. Eunom. i. 19, who takes the same line as Athanasius. Hilary de synod. 86 gives a different account of the rejection of the word at Antioch, which he says was due to the fact that Paul himself accepted it.

Tertullian had used its Latin equivalent adv. Prax. 4, "Filium non aliunde deduco sed de substantia Patris"; *ib.* 13, "solem et radium ejus tam duas res et duas species unius et indivisae substantiae numerabo quam Deum et Sermonen Ejus, quam Patrem et Filium" (comp. Apol. 21; adv. Marc. iii. 6). Justin Martyr taught the same truth, Dial. 128, speaking of the Son of God as His "Power," *Δύναμιν γεγεννῆσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρός . . . οὐ κατὰ ἀποτομὴν, ὡς ἀπομεριζομένης τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας.* Origen too, according to Pamphilus, had used the very word *ὁμοούσιον** to express the Son's relation to the Father.

Yet the word was not, even in Nicene times, one of unmistakable precision of meaning;† it was only as defining, and defined by, the other clauses in the Creed that it was thereby invested with a technical meaning which it never afterwards lost. Athanasius himself was by no means wedded to the use of it. In his Orations it only occurs once (i. 9), and once in his Expositio Fidei (ch. 2), but more frequently de synodis, ad Serap., ad Afros, and contr. Apollin.

13 *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.* The phrase is taken from the Caesarean Creed, and is based upon 1 Cor. viii. 6; John i. 3; Col. i. 16. In theological language the Son of

* Pamphil. Apol. pro Orig. Frag. 3 in comm. in Heb. apud Routh Rel. Sacr. iv. 318 (see Bigg, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 179, note).

† The shifting uses of *οὐσία* prevented this. Philosophically *οὐσία* had been used to denote both the "idea" which logically precedes the thing, and also the material thing considered by itself. Thus with the Stoics it was equivalent to *ὕλη* or *σῶμα*. The Gnostics introduced its use into theology (Iren. i. 5, 1), where it held its idealistic sense. *Ὁμοούσιος* would thus mean "of essential unity." All species of the same genus would be *ὁμοούσια* with each other. But as God is unique in Nature and Essence, One Who is *ὁμοούσιος* with Him must be Very God also. And this is exactly what the Nicene Fathers meant (Athan. de synod. 50, 51).

God is the "Instrument of creation," the mediate Agent of its "becoming." His action is thus co-ordinate and co-operant with that of the Father (John v. 17). All finite being, phenomenal and noumenal, springs from (ἐκ) the Father through (διά) the Son. To write ἐξ οὗ of the Son would be Sabellianism. Creation, if we may so speak and understand it, is the expression by the Word of the thought of God under finite conditions—the giving a distinct creaturely existence to His "ideas" (Rev. iv. 11). And while He is immanent in the cosmos He yet transcends it (Eph. iv. 6). On physical grounds creation out of nothing is unthinkable; it is "by faith that we make it thinkable" that the visible order as a whole has not been brought into finite being out of things which appear (Heb. xi. 3), but from out of its archetype in the "idea" of God. It "was life in the Word" (John i. 3; see Augustin. *ad loc.*), and even now He is its principle of consistency and its ultimate end (Col. i. 16; Rev. xxii. 13). Hence He is termed ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ (Rev. iii. 14), "the deep principle by which any creation becomes possible" (Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 77). This view of creation guards us from looking upon it as a "paroxysm of initiation," and leads us to regard it as a continuous act of the will of God (John v. 17; Heb. xi. 3). It is possible to see in this relation of the Word to the created universe an *à priori* reason for the Incarnation. On the one hand is God Infinite and Unknowable; on the other man craving a knowledge of God. The Divine immanence in creation suggests a mode whereby God may be revealed to man. The Incarnation bridges over the gulf, unites the finite and Infinite, and so reveals God as alone He could be revealed to a created intelligence.

15 *τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.* This reason is perhaps distinct from that of the Atonement, which is given in the immediately succeeding words. The Caesarean Creed did not contain this phrase: it read simply *τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα*; so that the words must have been inserted to convey an additional idea. If so, they perhaps point to the satisfaction of the spiritual, moral, and intellectual demands of man's rational nature (wholly irrespective of the Fall) by Christ's revelation of the Triune Nature of God.

Osiander (quoted by Westcott, "Gospel of Creation," Essay in *Epistles of St. John*, page 315) finds support for the Scotist view of the necessity of the Incarnation in the distinction of these two clauses, *δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν.* His words are "Quis non videat Spiritum Sanctum hic duas inter sese longe diversissimas causas ostendere propter quas Filius Dei descenderit de caelis et homo factus sit? Quarum prior est quia nos homines eramus homines, propter ipsum et imagine ejus conditi, qui conditi nunquam fuissemus nisi ipse quoque voluisset homo fieri et inter nos versari. Posterior causa est quia peccatum corrueramus in mortem, unde nos eruere et salutem nobis restituere dignatus est."

But the verb *κατελθόντα* belongs to both clauses, and implies the assumption of a passible humanity and a human life, albeit of Perfect Man, lived under the conditions of fallen man. Our Lord came "in likeness of flesh of sin" (Rom. viii. 3).

More probably the words were inserted in view of the Arian blasphemy that the Son's existence was relative to ours, and were intended to say, "He was not *made* for our sakes, but He did *become incarnate* for us." The Arian

view is given by Alexander (Encycl. apud Socr. i. 6), *δι' ἡμᾶς γὰρ πεποίηται, ἵνα ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ ὡς δι' ὀργάνου κτίσῃ ὁ Θεός· καὶ οὐκ ἂν ὑπέστη εἰ μὴ ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἤθελεν ποιῆσαι.* And again by Athan. Encycl. ad Episcop. Aegypt. 12, *τότε γὰρ γέγονεν ὅτε βεβούληται αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς δημιουργῆσαι· ἐν γὰρ τῶν πάντων ἔργων ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτός*; and again, quoting the Thalia, Or. c. Ar. i. 5, *εἶτα θελήσας ἡμᾶς δημιουργῆσαι, τότε δὴ πεποίηκεν ἕνα τινὰ, καὶ ὠνόμασεν αὐτὸν Λόγον καὶ Σοφίαν καὶ Υἱὸν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτὸν δημιουργήσῃ.*

16 *καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν.* We have already seen that this phrase is adopted from the Caesarean Creed. In Scripture the purpose of the Incarnation is uniformly viewed as the salvation of the world (Luke xix. 10; John iii. 16, 17, xii. 47).

κατελθόντα. This verb describes the laying aside of the outward manifestations of Divine Glory, the "separable accidents" of Deity—the *κένωσις* of Cyril's epistles (see note, *ad loc.*)—to which the Son of God voluntarily submitted in the act of Incarnation. He placed Himself under such conditions and limitations as belong to *perfect* human nature—and of these in our fallen state we are probably not capable of forming a judgment—in order to become really and truly Man (Phil. ii. 7 foll.). The word *κατελθόντα* is responded to by *ἀνελθόντα* below, which describes the reassumption by the Son of God, now in His glorified humanity, of all that had been laid aside (see Leo's teaching on the "self-emptying" in the Tome, § 3).

κατελθόντα did not appear in the Caesarean or early Jerusalem creeds, and was probably taken up from the

Antiochene. But the whole phrase *κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν* as it stands in the revised Jerusalem Creed is found in effect in Cyril's Catecheses, iv. 9, *διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἐξ οὐρανῶν κατῆλθεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.*

17 *σαρκωθέντα.* *Σαρκόομαι* is not found in the N.T., but occurs in late medical writers, Aretaeus and Galen, in the sense of "becoming flesh." In ecclesiastical writers (so far as I have noticed) it is always used of the Incarnation. Irenaeus, i. 10. 1, has *σαρκοθέντα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας.* Arius and Euzoïus also wrote *σαρκοθέντα* according to Socrat. i. 26, though Sozomen, ii. 27, gives *σάρκα ἀναλάβοντα,* and this is the more usual expression: *e.g.* in the creed of the Apost. Constit.; the First Antiochene or Eusebian encyclical of 341, Socr. ii. 10, Athan. de synod. 22; the Homoion creed of Seleucia, 359, Socr. ii. 40, Athan. de synod., 29.

σαρκωθέντα stood alone in the Caesarean Creed, but the Council rightly felt that by itself it was not an effective safeguard of the Incarnation from Arian evasion. It did not, for instance, exclude the Lucianic tenet that the Word took flesh only, without a human soul (Epiphan. Ancor. 33, *Λουκιανὸς γὰρ καὶ πάντες Λουκιανισταὶ ἀρνοῦνται τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ψυχὴν εἰληφέναι· σάρκα μὲν μόνον φασὶν ἐσχηκέναι.* Comp. Lucian's *Confession of Faith*, apud Ruffinus on Euseb. H.E. ix. 6, in Routh, Rel. Sacr. iii. 286, "Deus . . . Sapientiam suam misit in hunc mundum carne vestitam"). Nor does it lift the Incarnation above the level of a mere Theophany. The Council therefore added from the Jerusalen Creed *ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,* "dwelt amongst men as Man"; and the two verbs together correspond to St. John's *ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν.*

The Arian view was unequivocally expressed in the creed of Eudoxius of Constantinople—*σαρκωθέντα οὐκ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· οὔτε γὰρ ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀνείληφεν, ἀλλὰ σὰρξ γέγονεν, ἵνα διὰ σαρκὸς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὡς διὰ παραπετάσματος Θεὸς ἡμῖν χρηματίσῃ· οὐ δύο φύσεις, ἐπεὶ μὴ τέλειος ἦν ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ ψυχῆς Θεὸς ἐν σαρκί* (Hahn, p. 261. Comp. Athan. c. Apollin. i. 15, ii. 3). In order to expressly reject this heresy and Apollinarian developments of it, the Armenian Church expanded this clause of their creed as follows—*ἐνανθρώπησεν, ἐγεννήθη τελείως ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου διὰ Π. Ἁγ. ὥστε λαβεῖν σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ νοῦν καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἐστὶν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀληθινῶς καὶ οὐ δοκήσει* (Hahn, p. 152). Justin Martyr employed the rarer expression *ἀνδρούμενον*, Apol. i. 31.

18 *ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.* The verb is peculiar to ecclesiastical Greek, and is not used in the N.T. Here it replaces *ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον* of Caesarea. It is intended to express the *permanent* union of God with Human Nature; but, as it afterwards proved, it was not sufficiently technical to exclude heretical theories as to the mode of the union, whether by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh (Apollinarianism), or by union with a human person (Nestorianism; see Cyril. Epist. 2 ad Nest.).

No clause dealing with the mode of the Incarnation finds place in the Nicene Creed. Earlier Western creeds generally contained one: *e.g.* Irenaeus iii. 4. 1, "Qui . . . eam quae esset ex Virgine generationem sustinuit"; and more definitely Tertullian de praescr. haer. 13, "delatum ex Spiritu Patris Dei et Virtute in Virginem Mariam, carnem factum in utero ejus et ex ea natum." Comp. Marcellus—*γεννηθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας*

τῆς παρθένου. The two operations, Luke i. 35, Matt. i. 20, are variously expressed, generally in Greek by *ἐκ* followed by the simple copula (*καὶ*), but more usually in Latin by "*de* Sp. S. *ex* Maria V." Augustine, de fid. et symb. 8, has "*per* Sp. S. *ex* V. M."; and Serm. ad Catech. 6, "*de* Sp. S. *et* V. M."; and so Leo in his Tome. It is curious that the popular Latin version of the West represented the *ἐκ . . . καὶ* of the Greek by de . . . ex; whence comes our own English version "*by* the Holy Ghost *of* the Virgin Mary."

Such a clause was useful in excluding the Apollinarian and Valentinian notions that the Body of Christ was not derived from the substance of His mother (see note below on the Tome, § 2). It naturally found a place in the later revised creed of Jerusalem, and had often been dwelt upon by Cyril in his Lectures: *e.g.* iv. 9, *γεννηθεὶς ἐξ ἁγίας παρθένου καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος*: xii. 3, *ἐκ παρθένου καὶ Πν. Ἁγ. κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.*

19 *παθόντα.* So the Caesarean Creed, simply; no description of the mode of the Passion being added. The Jerusalem Creed read (instead of *παθόντα*) *σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα*; and some of the earlier Western creeds, and the later Jerusalem, inserted the historic detail of the name of the Roman procurator: *e.g.* Iren. iii. 4. 1, "passus sub Pontio Pilato"; Tertull. de virg. vel. 1, "crucifixum sub P. Pilato"; Revised Jerusalem, *σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Π. Πιλάτου καὶ παθόντα.* This express mention of Pilate by name is of constant recurrence in early Christian writings; Acts iii. 13, iv. 27; 1 Tim. vi. 13; Ignat. Magn. 11; Trall. 9; Smyrn. 1; Just. Mart. Apol. i. 13; Dial. 30; and it was doubtless

from Christian sources that Tacitus gained his knowledge, Ann. xv. 44, "Auctor nominis ejus Chrestus Tiberio imperitante procuratorem P. Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat." Its insertion in various creeds probably dates from earliest days when in preaching to the heathen it was necessary to insist on the historic reality of the Passion, which they might be tempted to regard as merely a "myth" veiling a moral lesson. Augustine says that it was intended to fix the date of the Crucifixion (de fid. et symb. 11, "Addendum enim erat judicis nomen propter temporum cognitionem"), but the better known name of the Emperor would have served such a purpose more effectually.

The reading of the early Jerusalem Creed, *καὶ ταφέντα*, which finds no place here, was naturally retained in the revised formulary. The Burial, as an article of the faith, was indeed ranked by St. Paul amongst the "first principles" of Christian instruction, because of its importance in leading to the Resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 3).

Cyril himself in his Lectures also dwells upon Christ's Descent into Hades, though the clause itself does not appear in the collated text of his creed as usually given. Catech. iv. 11, *κατῆλθεν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια*; xiv. 18, 19, *κατελθόντα εἰς ᾅδην.* The phrase is found also in the Sirmian "Dated" Creed of May 22, 359, drawn up by Valens and Ursacius, and read five days later at Ariminum—*καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατελθόντα*—and this is its first actual appearance in a creed. This Arian formulary, after a revision at Nicé on October 10, which left this phrase unaltered, was finally adopted at Constantinople on December 31, with the reading *καὶ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια κατεληλυθότα* (Socr. ii. 37, 41; Theodor. H.E. ii. 16). The clause is next found in the orthodox creed of Aquileia

as given by Ruffinus, A.D. 390—"Descendit in inferna"—neither the Roman nor Eastern creeds possessing it (Ruff. in symb. Ap. 18). There can be little doubt that the fact of our Lord's descent into Hades did form part of the regular instruction delivered to catechumens, although it might not be formulated in the creed. As Ruffinus says (*l.c.*), it was implied in the clause "was buried." There was a real severance between the vital union of Soul and Body. The Body was laid in the tomb, the Spirit went to the place of the departed. Our Lord's Death was a real death; and so the clause has its importance as excluding Docetic notions, and as emphasizing the existence of the Human Soul in Christ, which the Arians and Apollinarians denied.

In the Latin Western creeds the inseparable Personal Union of God the Son with both the Soul and the Body is expressed by the subject of each verb being the same —"Mortuus, sepultus, descendit" (comp. Athan. c. Apollin. i. 18, ii. 15). Cyril of Alexandria, in his Second Letter to Nestorius, argues for a real Incarnation on the same ground of the identity of Person of the Only-begotten with Him who suffered.

20 *ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.* All complete creeds contain clauses couched in nearly identical terms on the Resurrection, Ascension, and Second Advent; the revised Jerusalem Creed adding to this clause from 1 Cor. xv. 4, *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*, where the allusion is no doubt to Psalm xvi. 10, Hosea vi. 2, and to Christ's words, Luke xxiv. 46. The Scriptural prophecy dealt with the fact of the Christ's resurrection, not with the exact interval between His death and rising again. John ii. 19 and Mark x. 33 are the only recorded utterances of our Lord which refer

to the duration of this interval. Athanasius, de Inc. V. Dei 26, gives three reasons for this particular period of three days:—(*a*) Not on the same day, lest the real Death should be denied; (*b*) not on the second day, lest His incorruption should not be clearly manifested; (*c*) not later than the third day, lest the identification of His Body should be questioned and the events forgotten.

21 *ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς*. The phrase is not to be understood in the sense of a literal local ascent. The visible Ascension which the disciples witnessed (Luke xxiv. 51; Acts i. 9) was symbolical of the definite withdrawal of the Risen Lord into the higher plane of spiritual being upon which He had entered *as Man* concurrently with His Resurrection. "Heaven" is not a place but a spiritual state, and the Ascension was the natural sequel to the Resurrection (comp. Eph. iv. 10; Heb. vii. 26).

Note the omission here, as in the Caesarean model, of any clause relating to the Session at the right hand of God. Place is given it in both the earlier and later creeds of Jerusalem and in that of Lucian of Antioch, as well as in the three forms given by Tertullian, but not in Irenaeus. The metaphor denotes the position of honour and felicity (1 Kings ii. 19; Psalm xvi. 11, cx. 1), power and sovereignty (Matt. xxvi. 64; Heb. viii. 1). It is based upon Eph. i. 20; 1 Peter iii. 22; Col. iii. 1; Heb. i. 3, x. 12, xii. 2; comp. Rom. viii. 34; Acts vii. 56; 1 Cor. xv. 25. Comp. Primasius (cited by Westcott on Heb. viii. 1), "Plenitudinem majestatis summamque gloriam beatitudinis et prosperitatis debemus per dexteram intelligere in qua Filius sedet."

Cyril in his Lectures, xi. 17, xiv. 27–30, arguing against Arianism, emphatically urges that the Session at the right hand, with the possession of the Divine Glory which it implied, belonged to the Son from all eternity, and did not begin after His Ascension. [Hence perhaps the change from *καθίσαντα* of the early Jerusalem Creed to the present tense, *καθεζόμενον*, in the revised.] But the point intended by the clause is that the Incarnate Son, Jesus Christ, in His twofold Nature, Human as well as Divine, assumed by His Ascension that Divine position and glory which had ever been His in His Divine Nature. The throne of God is *now* shared (Rev. iii. 21) by One Who is clad in our nature, the Perfect Sympathizer (Heb. v. 1–10), the unceasing Intercessor (Heb. vii. 25), the Advocate turned towards the Father. (1 John ii. 1.) Comp. Iren. i. 10. 1, *καὶ τὴν ἔνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν* ("et *in carne* in caelos ascensionem"); Athan. Expos. Fid. 1, *ἡμῖν ἔδειξεν ἄνοδόν τε εἰς οὐρανοὺς ὅπου πρόδρομος εἰσῆλθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὁ κυριακὸς ἄνθρωπος* [= the Lord's Humanity] *ἐν ᾧ μέλλει κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.* Ruffin. in symb. Ap. 31, "Ascendit ergo ad caelos, non ubi Verbum Deus ante non fuerat, quippe qui semper erat in caelis et manebat in Patre, sed ubi Verbum caro factum ante non sedebat." This doctrine has been the inspiration of such hymns as Michael Bruce's "Where high the heavenly temple stands"; and Dr. Bright's stanza—

> "His Manhood pleads where now It lives
> On heaven's eternal throne."

22 *ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.* The phrase comes originally from 1 Peter iv. 5. The present participle should be given its own force. The "coming" in present judgments is not less true than that doctrine of

the Lord's Second Advent which was prominent in the minds of the early Christians, who naturally regarded the "coming" rather as an event than a process (Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 19, v. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Rev. xx. 12). The future participle *ἥξοντα* is found only in the Caesarean of the Greek creeds; but the familiar influence of the Latin "venturus" has penetrated even into the English translation of *ἐρχόμενον* in the "Nicene" Creed.

The Caesarean Creed also added *πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ* after *ἥξοντα*. This idea of the "glorious majesty" is strictly Scriptural (Matt. xvi. 27, xxiv. 30, xxv. 31; Mark viii. 38, xiii. 26; Luke ix. 26, xxi. 27), and found a place in the majority of creeds, Western and Eastern. Irenaeus, i. 10. 1, *καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ*: *ib.* iii. 4, "in gloria venturus"; Tertull. de praescr. haer. 13, "venturus cum claritate"; Lucian of Antioch, *πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως*: early Jerusalem, *ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ*: revised, *πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης*.

A further clause stood in the early Jerusalem Creed (as in the Apost. Const. vii. 41, and in the later Jerusalem) expressive of the eternity of Christ's regal office, in words taken directly from Luke i. 33—*οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος*. The phrase was valuable against a minor deduction from an erroneous conception of the Logos which was associated with the name of Marcellus. "The theory ascribed to him was that the Logos was an impersonal Divine power, immanent from eternity in God, but issuing from Him in the act of creation, and entering at last into relation with the human person of Jesus, who thus became God's 'Son.' But this 'expansion' of the original Divine unity would be followed by a 'contrac-

tion,' when the Logos would retire from Jesus, and God would again be all in all" (Bright, *Notes on the Canons*, p. 99). 1 Cor. xv. 24 was therefore naturally but wrongly interpreted of the surrender by Christ of such kingship as must for ever belong to Him as God. Cyril combated this notion in his Lectures (iv. 15, *τὸν Χριστὸν ἐξ οὐρανῶν προσδόκα . . . βασιλεύοντα βασιλείαν οὐράνιον, αἰώνιον καὶ ἀτελεύτητον. Ἀσφαλίζου γάρ μοι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ, ἐπειδὴ πολλοί εἰσιν οἱ λέγοντες τέλος εἶναι τῆς Χριστοῦ βασιλείας*: xv. 27, *κἄν ποτέ τινος ἀκούσῃς λέγοντος ὅτι τέλος ἔχει ἡ Χριστοῦ βασιλεία, μίσησον τὴν αἵρεσιν· τοῦ δράκοντός ἐστιν ἄλλη κεφαλὴ προσφάτως περὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν ἀναφυεῖσα*); and a similar clause was inserted in creeds which were equally opposed to Marcellus and Athanasius; *e.g.* the fourth Antiochene, presented to Constans in 342, *οὗ ἡ βασιλεία ἀκατάπαυστος οὖσα διαμενεῖ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἔσται γὰρ καθεζόμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλονει* (Socr. ii. 18). This was repeated in the Philippopolis recension of the same creed in 343, in the Makrostich of 344, and in the first Sirmian Creed of 351.

23 *καὶ*. The copula must again be given its full significance. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity which is thus implicitly asserted forms, as has been already said, the framework of these more elaborate expressions of the Faith. Athanasius has an interesting passage on this point, ad Afros 11, which is worth quoting in full:—*Αὕτη γὰρ ἡ ἐν Νικαίᾳ σύνοδος ἀληθῶς στηλογραφία κατὰ πάσης αἱρέσεώς ἐστιν, αὕτη καὶ τοὺς βλασφημοῦντας εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον καὶ λέγοντας αὐτὸ κτίσμα ἀνατρέπει. εἰρηκότες γὰρ οἱ πατέρες περὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν πίστεως, ἐπήγαγον*

εὐθύς Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ἵνα τελείαν καὶ πλήρη τὴν εἰς τὴν Ἁγίαν Τριάδα πίστιν ὁμολογήσαντες, τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ πίστεως, καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν τούτῳ γνωρίσωσι. Δῆλον γὰρ καὶ παρ' ὑμῖν καὶ παρὰ πᾶσι καθέστηκε, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἂν Χριστιανῶν ἀμφίβολον εἰς τοῦτο σχοίη τὴν διάνοιαν, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν ἡ πίστις εἰς τὴν κτίσιν, ἀλλ' εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τον Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ· καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον· ἕνα Θεὸν τὸν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ τελείᾳ Τριάδι γινωσκόμενον (comp. ad Jovian. 4).

23 *εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.* The Caesarean, Alexandrian, and Jerusalem creeds in uniformity with the first two articles—*εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν . . . εἰς ἕνα Κύριον* Ἰ. Χ.—read here *εἰς ἓν Πν. Ἅγιον*, and it seems strange that *ἓν* should have dropped out, particularly as it has direct Scriptural authority (Eph. iv. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 13). Athanasius himself naturally uses this form when referring to the Nicene Creed as really a confession of faith in the Holy Trinity, ad Afros 11 (quoted in last note), and so also Alexander of Alexandria, apud Theodor. H.E. i. 4 (see Appendix iii.). Comp. Joan Damasc. de fide orth. 8, *ὁμοίως πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓν Πν. Ἅγιον, κ.τ.λ.*

24 *Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, κ.τ.λ.* The anathematisms which follow are an integral part of the document, although they do not add anything to the substance of the creed, but only condemn a number of Arian statements respecting the Second Person of the Trinity, which were contrary to the Church's teaching and untenable in her communion. Their presence shows that the Council did not

intend its creed to be a Baptismal symbol or a popular declarative creed superseding the existing formularies of the different local churches, but simply a "dogmatic standard constructed for a particular emergency," and proposed for signature as a test of orthodoxy.

Had the Council intended to draw up a complete creed, there were clauses at hand in the creed of Jerusalem, on the Paraclete, Baptism, Forgiveness of Sins, the Church, the Resurrection, and Eternal Life; but evidently neither Eusebius of Caesarea, who had only quoted the creed of his Church as far as the clause *πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον*, nor the Council generally thought it necessary to cite or insert clauses on subjects as to which no heterodoxy had been expressed—"confessi sunt quod negabatur; tacuerunt de quo nemo quaerebat" (Jerome Epist. 41 ad Pam. et Ocean). Compare on this point of omission the Eusebian encyclical of Antioch in 341, which, while fairly adequate on the Second Person, ends *πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Εἰ δὲ δεῖ προσθεῖναι πιστεύομεν καὶ περὶ σαρκὸς ἀναστάσεως καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου* (Athan. de Synod. 22; Socr. ii. 10).

It was not until the Ephesine Council in 431 that it was converted into a Baptismal profession (canon 7), and not until Chalcedon in 451 that it was termed a *σύμβολον*. The Council of Laodicaea (canon 7) in 363 spoke generally of *τὰ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολα*, but without distinct reference to the Nicene Creed. The anathematisms were naturally not taken over into local creeds, which were otherwise expanded from the Nicene. They are, however, still retained, and expanded to include similar denials respecting the Holy Spirit, in the enlarged creed recited in the Armenian liturgy (Hahn, p. 153; Brightman, i. 426).

The object of the anathematisms was to afford no loophole for the evasion of the strict meaning of the terms used in the creed. Some of the anathemas appended to various Arianising creeds did offer such loopholes: *e.g.* the insertion of *χρόνος* and *ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων* in the anathemas of the Dedication creed of 341.

24 *Ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν.* "Once He was not." This phrase was intended by Arius to deny the eternal co-existence of the Son with the Father (Alexander ap. Theodor. H.E. i. 4; id. encycl. ap. Socr. i. 6; Athan. Or. c. Arian. i. 5, *etc.*). Arius' rationalistic temper of mind led him to import into Divine relations some of those limitations which are necessarily inherent in human relations. As a human son is posterior in time to his father, so Arius concluded that the Divine Son must be of later existence than the Divine Father. "There was," therefore, "when He did not exist." He overlooked the fact that "Father" and "Son" are correlative terms, not necessarily involving any notions of before and after; and that even in the human sphere fatherhood and sonship spring into co-existence simultaneously (comp. Athan. Or. c. Arian. i. 26 foll., iii. 6). The Catholic doctrine of this Eternal relation had been expressed by Origen, de princ. iv. 1. 28, *οὔκ ἐστιν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*, a direct negative to the Arian teaching; Hom. in Ierem. ix. 4, *ἀεὶ γεννᾷ ὁ Πατὴρ τὸν Υἱόν*: comp. de princ. i. 2. 4, 10, and apud Apol. Pamphil. pro Orig., *ὁ Σωτὴρ ἀεὶ γεννᾶται* (Routh Rel. Sacr. iv. 304); and by Dionysius of Rome contr. Sabell. apud Athan. de decr. Nic. 26, *εἰ γὰρ γέγονεν Υἱὸς, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν· ἀεὶ δὲ ἦν, εἴ γε ἐν τῷ Πατρί ἐστι, ὡς αὐτός φησι, καὶ εἰ Λόγος καὶ Σοφία καὶ Δύναμις ὁ Χριστός*—passages which show that the Arian position had

been already met and refuted in the third century, and that the Catholic "Theology" was fixed long before the date usually assigned to it. Comp. Alexander writing to Alexander of Byzantium in 324, apud Theod. H.E. i. 4, *ἀνάγκη τὸν Πατέρα ἀεὶ εἶναι Πατέρα. Ἔστι δὲ Πατὴρ ἀεὶ παρόντος τοῦ Υἱοῦ δι' ὃν χρηματίζει Πατήρ.* And again, apud Epist. Ar. ad Euseb. Nicom., id. 5, *ἀεὶ ὁ Θεὸς, ἀεὶ ὁ Υἱός· οὔτε ἐπινοίᾳ οὔτε ἀτόμῳ τινὶ προάγει ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Υἱοῦ· ἀεὶ Θεὸς, ἀεὶ Υἱός.*

25 *πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν.* This formula, which Arius used in his letter to Alexander—*οὐκ ἦν πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι,* Athan. de synod. 16; and again to Eusebius of Nicomedia—*πρὶν γεννηθῇ οὐκ ἦν,* Theodor. H.E. i. 5; comp. Athan. Or. c. Ar. i. 5—is really only another method of expressing the idea contained in *ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*; *i.e.* it is not a denial of an assumed Catholic tenet that the Son *did* exist before His Generation, but an Arian statement that His Generation implied a previous period when the Son did not exist. It was due to a misconception of the Generation as a temporal or pre-temporal act instead of as an intemporal relation. Comp. Augustin. Tract. 42. 8 in Ioan., "Quod vero de Deo processit Verbum aeterna processio est: non habet tempus per Quem factum est tempus. Nemo dicat in corde suo antequam esset Verbum quomodo erat Deus? Nunquam dicas antequam esset Verbum Dei. Nunquam Deus sine Verbo fuit."

Eusebius' explanation of this anathema is certainly not the interpretation which the Council intended it to bear. He turned it into a mere truism, by making the "Generation" mean the Human Birth. His words, as given in his letter to his diocese (apud Athan. Append. to de decr.

Nic., and Theodor. H.E. i. 12), are, Ἔτι μὴν τὸ ἀναθεματίζεσθαι τὸ "πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν" οὐκ ἄτοπον ἐνομίσθη, τῷ παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν ὁμολογεῖσθαι εἶναι αὐτὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα γεννήσεως. Athanasius twice refers to these words of Eusebius, as though they implied a supposed denial by the Arians of the Son's existence before His Incarnation; de synod. 13, de decr. Nic. 3. The passage is indeed omitted in Socrates' transcript of the letter (H.E. i. 8), and Bull believed it to be an Arian interpolation (Def. F.N. iii. 9. 3), but on scarcely sufficient grounds.

26 *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο.* This also was Arius' own phrase: Athan. de synod. 14; Alexand. encycl. Socr. i. 8; Arius' letter to Euseb. Nicom., Theod. i. 4. It became the watchword of the thorough-going Arians, the Anomaeans, who were termed in consequence "Exoukontians," Socr. ii. 45; Athan. de synod. 31. Theodor. Haer. iv. 3. It is directly opposed by the *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας* of the creed.

27 *ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας.* That the Son was foreign in essence to the Father was taught by Arius in his Thalia (apud Athan. de synod. 15, *Ξένος τοῦ Υἱοῦ κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ Πατήρ*) and by Eusebius of Nicomedia (Epist. ad Paulin. Tyr. apud Theodor. i. 6, *οὐκ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ γεγονός . . . ἀλλ' ἕτερον τῇ φύσει*).

It is clear that the Nicene Fathers used *ὑπόστασις* and *οὐσία* here synonymously. Without going deeply into philosophical refinements, we may say that *οὐσία* represented abstract being, while *ὑπόστασις* represented a concrete form of being. Ὑπόστασις was not originally a philosophical term, but after passing through various materialistic uses (Socr. iii. 7) it acquired a fundamental

meaning of "reality." In the N.T. its use is still unfixed. Thus in 2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17; Heb. iii. 14, it means that which gives a basis, "confidence"; in Heb. xi. 1, that which gives reality; but Heb. i. 3, "essence." In ecclesiastical usage it was originally equivalent to *οὐσία*; and so the Nicene Fathers, Aegypt, and the West generally, spoke of the One Personal God as *μία οὐσία* or *μία ὑπόστασις* (see Athan. ad Afr. 4, *ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαινόμενον ἔχει ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄν*: de synod. 41; Or. c. Ar. iii. 65, 66, iv. 1. 33; Euseb. Caes. Letter to dioc.; Jerom. Epist. xv. 4); but in the East it acquired a more specific sense, "that in virtue of which a Person is what he is"; and so Basil (Epist. 28) and the Easterns spoke of *μία οὐσία* existing in *τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*. These two modes of speaking were discussed in the Council of Alexandria held in 362, and mutual explanations were made (Athan. Tom. ad Ant. 5. Socr. iii. 7 misrepresents the meaning of the synodal letter, which did not disapprove of the words *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, but recommended adherence to Nicene Terminology). In Latin *substantia* represented *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* when both were synonymous: when they were distinguished *substantia* represented *οὐσία* (since *essentia* was disliked, though Augustine preferred it, de Trin. vii. 10, and Leo used it in the Tome, § 2), and *persona* translated *ὑπόστασις*, its Greek equivalent, *πρόσωπον*, being now often used instead of *ὑπόστασις*. Cyril uses both as synonymous in his fourth Anathema. Thus the Latin phraseology was "una substantia, tres personae." In the fourth century *φύσις* (*natura*) came into use, and Cyril employed it as equivalent to *ὑπόστασις* (see further in the note on Epist. 3 ad Nest.). Vincent of Lerins, however, used *substantia* for *natura*; and wrote, "In uno eodemque

Christo duae substantiae sunt: sed una Divina, altera Humana" (Common. 13), much as Melito of Sardis had written of Christ's Two Natures as *οὐσίαι* in his third book on the Incarnation (apud Routh Rel. Sacr. i. 115). Augustine, again, used *natura* as equivalent to *substantia*, de Trin. vii. 7.

29 *κτιστόν*. This word is read here by Socr. i. 8, and in Eusebius' transcript of the creed in his letter, according to Socrates and Athanasius. Theodoret alone omits it from the Eusebian transcript, and it was omitted in the version of the creed read in the Second Session at Chalcedon (Mansi, vi. 956).

The "creatureship" was a corollary of the denial of a *true* Sonship. Here was shown the illogical position of Arianism. It began by emphasizing the Sonship, and ended by robbing it of its verity. For Sonship implies community of nature with the Father, whereas Arianism, by denying the *ὁμοούσιον*, placed the Son amongst created beings, and made Him in consequence alien to the nature of the Father. "If Son, then not creature; if creature, then not Son," said Athanasius, tersely summing up the dilemma, de decr. Nic. 13. The Arian view developed as its premisses were pushed home. Arius did not at first see what his original denial involved. By insistence on the *ἀγεννησία* of true Deity, the Son fell into the order of *κτιστά*, and therefore was *ἀλλότριος καὶ ἀνόμοιος κατὰ πάντα τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας καὶ ἰδιότητος* (Athan. Or. c. Ar. i. 6). The attribution to such a being of Divine titles was simple paganism: indeed, Arian thought was largely coloured with polytheistic conceptions of Deity (Athan. ad Afr. 5; Or. c. Ar. i. 10, 18; ad episc. Aeg. 4, 13).

30 *τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτόν.* By *τρεπτόν*, "capable of moral change," the Arians meant in effect "peccable." *Φᾶσιν αὐτὸν τρεπτῆς εἶναι φύσεως, ἀρετῆς τε καὶ κακίας ἐπιδεκτικόν*, wrote Alexander to his namesake of Byzantium (Theodor. i. 4), describing Arius' teaching. *Οὐκ ἔστιν ἄτρεπτος, ὡς ὁ Πατὴρ, ἀλλὰ τρεπτός ἐστι φύσει, ὡς τὰ κτίσματα*, sang Arius in his Thalia (Athan. Or. c. Ar. i. 9). In another place Arius made this immutability dependent upon the Son's own volition: *ὑποστήσαντα ἰδίῳ θελήματι ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον* (Epist. to Alex. ap. Athan. de synod. 16); comp. the Thalia (Athan. *ib.* 5), *καὶ τῇ μὲν φύσει, ὥσπερ πάντες, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Λόγος ἐστὶ τρεπτὸς, τῷ δε ἰδίῳ αὐτεξουσίῳ, ἕως βούλεται, μενεῖ καλος· ὅτε μέντοι θέλει, δύναται τρέπεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς, τρεπτῆς ὢν φύσεως*: and Arian blasphemies quoted by Athan. encycl. ad episc. Aeg. 12, *καὶ τῇ μὲν φύσει τρεπτός ἐστι, τῷ δι᾽ ἰδίῳ αὐτεξουσίῳ, ὡς βούλεται, μένει καλός, ὅτε μέντοι θέλει, δύναται τρέπεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ πάντα.*

Alexander's encyclical (Socr. i. 6) relates how the question had been pushed home—"Could the Word of God be changed (*τραπῆναι*) as the Devil changed?" And the answer was, "Yes, He could; for He was *τρεπτῆς φύσεως, γενητὸς καὶ τρεπτὸς ὑπάρχων.*" Athanasius of Anazarbus boldly said that the Son of God was one of the hundred sheep (Athan. de synod. 17).

APPENDICES

TO

THE CREED OF NICAEA

I. Creed of Caesarea.

II. Creed of Jerusalem.

III. Creed of Alexandria.

IV. Creed of Justin Martyr.

V. Creed of the Apostolic Constitutions.

VI. Creeds of Antioch.

VII. Revised Creed of Jerusalem.

History, Annotations, and Detached Note on "Filioque."

VIII. Creeds of Epiphanius.

ist. Euseb. apud Socr. i. 8.
eod. i. 12.
han. App. to De Decr. Nic.

I. CREED OF CAESAREA

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν·
καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον,
Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ,
Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός,
Ζωὴν ἐκ Ζωῆς,
Υἱὸν μονογενῆ,
πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως,
πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον,
δι᾽ οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα·
τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα,
καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον,
καὶ παθόντα,
καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα,
καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς·
πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον.

* * * *

II. CREED OF JERUSALEM

COLLECTED FROM THE CATECHETICAL LECTURES OF CYRIL

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα,
ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων·
καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων,
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο,
σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα,
ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς,
καὶ καθίσαντα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός,
καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος·
καὶ εἰς ἓν Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα,
τὸν παράκλητον
τὸ λαλῆσαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις·
καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·
καὶ εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν·
καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν·
καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

III. CREED OF ALEXANDRIA

RESTORED FROM EPISTLE OF ALEXANDER TO ALEXANDER OF BYZANTIUM (apud Theodoret H.E. i. 4) AND ORIGEN (contr. Cels. i. 25)

Πιστεύομεν εἰς μόνον ἀγέννητον Πατέρα.
Orig. τὸν δημιουργὸν τῶν ὅλων,
Orig. τὴν ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς·
καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν
τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ,
γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς πρὸ αἰώνων
ἀτρεπτὸν καὶ ἀναλλοιωτόν,
εἰκόνα ἀπαράλλακτον τοῦ Πατρός,
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο,
σῶμα φορεσάντα ἀληθῶς καὶ οὐ δοκήσει ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας,
ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας ἐπιδημησάντα τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
σταυρωθέντα καὶ ἀποθανόντα,
ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν,
ἀναληφθέντα ἐν οὐρανοῖς,
καθήμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης·
ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον·
μίαν καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν·
οἴδαμεν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν.

IV. CREED OF JUSTIN MARTYR

COLLECTED FROM HIS WRITINGS*

Ap. i. 8, 67. [Πιστεύομεν εἰς] ἕνα Θεὸν τὸν πάντων Πατέρα καὶ δημιούργον·

D. 105. [καὶ εἰς] τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν τὸν μονογενῆ,

i. 21. τὸν Λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ,

D. 85. τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως,

i. 22, D. 61, 105, 128. ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα,

i. 6. δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα,

i. 32. τὸν σαρκωθέντα, ἀνθρώπον γενομένον,

i. 22, 63, D. 66, 85, 100, 105. διὰ τῆς παρθένου Μαρίας γεγεννημένον,

i. 13, 21, 61. σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντιου Πιλάτου,

D. 126, i. 21, 42. παθόντα, ἀποθανόντα,

i. 21, D. 85, 100, 107. ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν,

i. 21, D. 42, 85, 132. ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς,

D. 32. καθιζόντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Κυριοῦ πάντων Πατρός,

i. 50, 51, 53, D. 118, 132. καὶ πάλιν μετὰ δόξης παραγενησόμενον κριτὴν ζῶντων καὶ νεκρῶν·

i. 61, D. 7. [καὶ εἰς] Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον

τὸ διὰ τῶν προφήτων [λαλῆσαν]

D. 63. μίαν ἐκκλησίαν

i. 61. βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν

σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν.

* Bornemann's scheme of Justin's Creed, in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, iii. 1879, had not come under my notice when I selected these phrases. His scheme is not so full, nor is it arranged on the same plan; but Justin unquestionably held these truths, and it is interesting to see how they coincide, often verbally, with other and later creeds.

V. CREED OF THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS

vii. 41.

Πιστεύω καὶ βαπτίζομαι εἰς ἕνα ἀγέννητον μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν
παντοκράτορα, τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ,
κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ἁπάντων.
ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα·
καὶ εἰς τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν
τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ Υἱόν
τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως
τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὁρατά τε καὶ ἀόρατα,
τὸν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἐξ οὐρανῶν καὶ σάρκα ἀναλαβόντα,
ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου Μαρίας γεννηθέντα,
καὶ πολιτευσάμενον ὁσίως κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,
καὶ σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου,
καὶ ἀποθανόντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,
καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς,
καὶ καθεσθέντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρός,
καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τελος·

βαπτίζομαι καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον,
τοῦτ᾽ ἐστὶν τὸν παράκλητον,
τὸ ἐνεργῆσαν ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος ἁγίοις,
ὕστερον δὲ ἀποσταλὲν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς κατὰ τὴν εὐαγγελίαν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
καὶ μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους δὲ πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ·
εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν,
καὶ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,
καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν,
καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

VI. CREEDS OF ANTIOCH

I. LUCIANIC FORM

THIS "ecthesis," the Second of the Antiochene series, was adopted by the Dedication Council of Antioch in 341. The Council asserted that it had been written by Lucian;* and that the greater part of it was the work of Lucian is probable enough; but there are evident marks of affinity between this creed and some of the phraseology of the letter of the synod of 269 to Paul of Samosata.† The anti-Sabellian addition at the end, along with the words τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν in the first article, and the central phrase ἄτρεπτόν τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον· [τὴν] τῆς θεότητος . . . εἰκόνα are all Origenistic in tone (comp. his Comm. in Ioan. xiii. 36; contr. Cels. i. 25; viii. 12);‡ the last phrase is indeed thoroughly Alexandrian, and was freely used by Alexander and by Athanasius, standing as it did in the Alexandrian Creed.§ The anti-Sabellian affirmation of Eusebius, appended to his recital of the Caesarean Creed at Nicaea,‖ is most probably based upon Lucian's, although it is just possible that the

* Sozom. iii. 5, Ἔλεγον δὲ ταύτην τὴν πίστιν ὁλόγραφον εὑρηκέναι Λουκιανοῦ τοῦ ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ μαρτυρήσαντος, ἀνδρὸς τά τε ἄλλα εὐδοκιμωτάτον καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς γραφὰς εἰς ἄκρον ἠκριβωκότος· πότερον δὲ ἀληθῶς ταῦτα ἔφασαν, ἢ τὴν ἰδίαν γραφὴν σεμνοποιοῦντες τῷ ἀξιώματι τοῦ μάρτυρος, λέγειν οὐκ ἔχω.

† Quoted above, note on μονογενῆ.

‡ Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, page 117 foll.

§ Alex. Epist. ap. Theod. H.E. i. 4; Athan. c. Gent. 41, 46, 47; Or. c. Ar. i. 26, ii. 33, iii. 5, 11. (I owe these last references to Gwatkin *op. cit.*)

‖ Quoted above, page 3.

Dedication Council borrowed from Eusebius. The verbal coincidence is certainly too striking to be accidental.

The Lucianic Creed has been preserved by Athanasius de synod. 23, by Socrates ii. 10, and in a Latin version by Hilary de synod. 29. In its present form it is probably the result of two revisions of the original baptismal creed of Antioch, which was amplified, first, by Lucian, with the insertion of Scriptural phrases and an anti-Sabellian appendix, and then enlarged at Antioch in 341 by a few other phrases and the addition of the two anathemas, which seem specially adapted to admit of Arian subscription, by their inclusion of *χρόνον* in the first, and *ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων* (and its parallels) in the second.*

The clauses which we may conjecture to have stood in the earliest form of the creed are underlined.

<u>Πιστεύομεν</u> (ἀκολούθως τῇ εὐαγγελικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ παραδόσει)
<u>εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα,</u>
<u>τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν τε καὶ ποιητὴν</u>
καὶ προνοητήν,
<u>ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα</u>·
<u>καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,</u>
<u>τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ Θεόν,</u>
<u>δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα,</u>
<u>τὸν γεννηθέντα πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός,</u>
<u>Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ</u>
ὅλον ἐξ ὅλου, μόνον ἐκ μόνου,

* Comp. Arius' letter to Alexander, ap. Athan. de synod. 16, *ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον κτίσμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τέλειον, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων· γέννημα, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ὡς ἓν τῶν γεγεννημένων.*

τέλειον ἐκ τελείου, βασιλέα ἐκ βασιλέως,
Κύριον ἀπὸ Κυρίου,
Λόγον ζῶντα, Σοφίαν ζῶσαν,
Φῶς ἀληθινὸν, ὁδὸν, ἀλήθειαν, ἀνάστασιν, ποιμένα, θύραν,
ἄτρεπτον τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον,
τῆς θεότητος οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα,
τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως
τὸν ὄντα ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, Λόγον Θεοῦ, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκεν·
τὸν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἄνωθεν,
καὶ γεννηθέντα ἐκ παρθένου κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,
καὶ ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον,
μεσίτην Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀπόστολόν τε τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς, ὥς φησιν ὅτι Καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ το θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με·
τὸν παθόντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,
καὶ ἀναστάντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς οὐρανούς,
καὶ καθεσθέντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρός,
καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς·

F

καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον

τὸ εἰς παράκλησιν καὶ ἁγιασμὸν καὶ τελείωσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσι διδόμενον

καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς διετάξατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς λέγων Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος· δηλονότι Πατρὸς ἀληθῶς Πατρὸς ὄντος, Υἱοῦ δὲ ἀληθῶς Υἱοῦ ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἀληθῶς Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὄντος, τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐχ ἁπλῶς οὐδὲ ἀργῶς κειμένων, ἀλλὰ σημαινόντων ἀκριβῶς τὴν οἰκείαν ἑκάστου τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ὑπόστασίν τε καὶ τάξιν καὶ δόξαν· ὡς εἶναι τῇ μὲν ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἕν.

Ταύτην οὖν ἔχοντες τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ μέχρι τέλους ἔχοντες ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, πᾶσαν αἱρετικὴν κακοδοξίαν ἀναθεματίζομεν.

καὶ εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ὑγιῆ τῶν γραφῶν ὀρθὴν πίστιν διδάσκει, λέγων ἢ χρόνον ἢ καιρὸν ἢ αἰῶνα ἢ εἶναι ἢ γεγονέναι πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι τὸν Υἱὸν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

καὶ εἴ τις λέγει τὸν Υἱὸν κτίσμα ὡς ἓν τῶν κτισμάτων ἢ γέννημα ὡς ἓν τῶν γεννημάτων, ἢ ποίημα ὡς ἓν τῶν ποιημάτων, καὶ μὴ ὡς αἱ θεῖαι γραφαὶ παραδέδωκεν, τῶν προειρημένων ἕκαστον ἀφ᾽ ἑκάστου· ἢ εἴ τι ἄλλο διδασκει, ἢ εὐαγγελίζεται, παρ᾽ ὃ παρελάβομεν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Ἡμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν παραδεδομένοις ὑπό τε προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων ἀληθινῶς τε καὶ ἐμφόβως καὶ πιστεύομεν καὶ ἀκολουθοῦμεν.

2. LATER REVISED FORMS

It is interesting to compare the Lucianic form with two others, which are here printed as illustrative of the plan on which early local creeds were, after Nicaea, enriched by phraseology taken from the Nicene formulary.

The first is only a fragment, extracted from the "Contestatio" (Mansi, iv. 1109) which Eusebius the Constantinopolitan advocate drew up in 429 in refutation of Nestorius, whom he compared with Paul of Samosata; and is supplemented by three clauses (the last three) rescued by Caspari and Heurtley from Chrysostom (Hom. xl. in 1 Cor. xv. 29).

The second is the full text of the Creed of Antioch to the end of its second division, which Cassian gives (de Incarn. vi. 3) with the object of refuting Nestorius by means of his own baptismal profession.

(A.)

. . . .
. . . . . .
. . . .
. . . . . .

Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί,
δι' οὗ καὶ οἱ αἰῶνες κατηρτίσθησαν καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο·
τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς κατελθόντα
καὶ γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς ἁγίας τῆς ἀειπαρθένου,
καὶ σταρωθεντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου

. . . . . .
. . . . . .
. . . .
. . . . .

Chrys. καὶ εἰς ἁμαρτιῶν ἄφεσιν,
Chrys. καὶ εἰς νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν,
Chrys. καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

(B.)

Cass. de incarn. vi. 3

Credo in unum et solum verum Deum, Patrem omnipotentem,
creatorem omnium visibilium et invisibilium creaturarum:
Et in Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum,
Filium ejus unigenitum,
et Primogenitum totius creaturae,
ex eo natum ante omnia saecula
et non factum,
Deum verum ex Deo vero,
homoousion Patri,
per quem et saecula compaginata sunt et omnia facta:
Qui propter nos venit,
et natus est ex Maria virgine,
et crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato
et sepultus,
et tertia die resurrexit secundum scripturas,
et in caelos ascendit,
et iterum veniet judicare vivos et mortuos.

VII. REVISED CREED OF JERUSALEM

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα
ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων·
καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν
τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Μονογενῆ,
τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων,
Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός,
Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί,
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο·
τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν,
καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου,
καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου,
καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα,
καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς,
καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός,
καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τελος·

καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον τὸ Κύριον τὸ Ζωοποιόν,
τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,
τὸ σὺν Πατρί καὶ Υἱῷ συνπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον,
τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν·
εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν·
ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βαπτίσμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·
προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν,
καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν.

The history of this formulary is of special interest, because it is the Creed which, in the almost universal use of Christendom, has (with two additions in the West) supplanted the original Nicene Symbol and wrongly usurped its name. Moreover, it was mainly due to the association of this Creed with the Council of Constantinople of 381 by the fathers at Chalcedon that the earlier synod gained its oecumenical character.

Its authorship is a matter of conjecture, but a careful examination of its wording shows it to be a revision of the early Creed of Jerusalem. As some of its clauses are clearly directed against Apollinarianism, Marcellianism, and Macedonianism, its date cannot be earlier than about A.D. 360. It has been very plausibly suggested * that a revision and enrichment of the Jerusalem Creed may have been carried out by Cyril about the years 362–364, after he returned to his diocese on the accession of Julian, at the time when he and his friend Meletius had finally severed themselves from the Acacian (Homoion and Homoiousion) party, and decisively adopted "the Nicene standard in its integrity." Whether this was so

* Hort, *Two Dissertations*, p. 96.

or not, the document had for its base the early Jerusalem Creed. One long Nicene extract, which included the all-important *ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί*, vindicated its loyalty to the Nicene faith; and for the rest it proceeded on Jerusalem lines, incorporating words and phrases from Cyril's own lectures, from the creeds of sister churches, and from Scriptural sources. The Nicene anathemas were naturally not appended, as the Creed was intended for general ecclesiastical purposes, popular and baptismal.

Two Nicene clauses which one might have expected to find in it were not employed: (1) The explanation of *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός* by *τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός*; and (2) the defining phrase *τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ* after *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.* Possibly the reason in both cases was doctrinal: the first may have been abused by Apollinarians, and pressed into the service of their tenet that the Flesh of Christ was co-essential with the Deity; the second may have been seized upon by Macedonians as implying that the Holy Spirit was one of the "things made" through the Son. The next point in the history of the formulary is its getting into the hands of Epiphanius before the year 374. Now Epiphanius was residing at Eleutheropolis (less than thirty miles south-west of Jerusalem) until 367, and after his removal to Cyprus was in constant communication with Palestine. In 374 he wrote an exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity at the request of some Pamphylian presbyters, which he termed *ὁ 'Αγκυρωτός* (Ancoratus, The Anchored One). In the last chapter but one, after emphasizing the necessity of keeping the faith and teaching it to others, he inserts a Creed which only differs from the revised Jerusalem formulary by the addition of the two Nicene

clauses above referred to, and the anathemas.* These Nicene additions may have been made purposely, with a view of making the whole formulary the symbol of his own diocese of Constantia, or may have been due to a mechanical assimilation of the one document to the older and better known one. The former theory may derive some support from the fact that he goes on to say that this Creed ought to be learned by every catechumen who is about to proceed to the holy laver. It is possible that Epiphanius, in those days of inexact citation, intended the Creed to be received as a transcript of the Nicene; but his words about it are not free from obscurity. He proceeds, *καὶ αὕτη μὲν ἡ πίστις παρεδόθη ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει ἀπὸ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν ἁγίων ἐπισκόπων ὑπὲρ τριακοσίων δέκα τὸν ἀριθμόν.* These words are remarkable and, as they stand, untrue; but Epiphanius' rhetoric is never to be too closely pressed. The reference to the number of the bishops is generally understood to designate the Council of Nicaea, and if so, we must assume that Epiphanius regarded the Creed as practically Nicene, because of its Nicene phrases. But what is the precise force of *τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει*? Is it meant to describe Nicaea? or is it a rhetorical descriptive epithet (borrowed from Rev. xxi. 2) in apposition with *ἐκκλησίᾳ*? or is it to be taken literally of "the Church in the Holy City," Jerusalem? Perhaps the passage is corrupt. At all events the insertion of another *καὶ* before *ἀπὸ πάντων* would give a consistent and true statement; namely, that the Creed was composed of apostolic, Jerusalem, and Nicene teaching. A suggestion, however, has been

* In the anathemas the place of *κτιστὸν ἢ τρεπτόν* is taken by *ῥευστόν* (=mutable).

thrown out that Epiphanius was referring to the "Council of Sardica, which, according to Sozomen, collected some 300 bishops from the West, and seventy from the East; 250 according to Theodoret." * But an examination of the language of Socrates and Sozomen in reference to the action of the Sardican Council shows that the special point elucidated by the formulary drawn up in 343 was the *ὁμοούσιον*, whereas the chief expansion in the Epiphanian Creed is in the final section relating to the Holy Spirit.†

Nothing more is heard of this formulary until seventy-seven years later the imperial commissioners at Chalcedon referred to "the exposition of the 318 fathers who had met at Nicaea and *the exposition of the 150 who had met at a later time.*" This was at the close of the first session. In the second session reference was again made to the "ecthesis" of the 318 and the 150; but the assembled bishops called for the Creed of Nicaea to be read. This was done, and then the commissioners ordered *τὰ ἐκτε-*

* Swainson, *Nicene and Apostles' Creeds*, pp. 80, 86.

† Socrates (ii. 20) states that the Sardican Council *τὸν ὅρον τε τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ κρατύναντες καὶ τὸ ἀνόμοιον ἐκβαλόντες, τὸ ὁμοούσιον ψανερώτερον ἐκδιδόασιν.* This is explained by Sozomen to mean an enlargement of the Nicene Creed on this particular point. His words are (iii. 12), *Ἐξέθεντο δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τηνικαῦτα πίστεως γραφὴν ἑτέραν, πλατυτέραν μὲν τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ, φυλάττουσαν δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ οὐ παρά πολὺ διαλλάττουσαν τῶν ἐκείνης ῥημάτων. Ἀμέλει Ὅσιος καὶ Πρωτογένης . . . δείσαντες ἴσως μὴ νομισθεῖεν τισὶ καινοτομεῖν τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς ἐν Νικαίᾳ, ἔγραψαν Ἰουλίῳ καὶ ἐμαρτύραντο κύρια τάδε ἡγεῖσθαι· κατὰ χρείαν δὲ σαφηνείας τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν πλατῦναι, ὥστε μὴ ἐγγενέσθαι τοῖς τὰ Ἀρείου φρονοῦσιν, ἀποκεχρημένοις τῇ συντομίᾳ τῆς γραφῆς εἰς ἄτοπον ἕλκεν τοὺς ἀπείρους διαλέξεως.* May not the last portion of what is given by Theodoret (H.E. ii. 8), as part of the letter of the Sardican Council (but which is not found in the letter as preserved by Athanasius, Apol. c. Arian. 49), be this more copious exposition? It certainly answers fairly well to Sozomen's description.

θέντα of the 150 also to be read; and Aetius, the archdeacon of Constantinople, read the revised Jerusalem Creed, at the conclusion of which the bishops exclaimed, "This is the faith of all the orthodox: this we all believe."*

The question now arises, how did this revised Jerusalem Creed, known to Epiphanius in 374, come to be associated with the 150 fathers of Constantinople in 381? There is but little that can be called evidence, but it is at least likely that the Creed did come before the Council of Constantinople and receive its approval. The grounds of this probability are these:

The Council's letter to the emperor described its own work as falling into three divisions: (*a*) it had renewed concord; (*b*) it had given voice to *συντόμους ὅρους, τήν τε τῶν πατέρων πίστιν τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ κυρώσαντες, καὶ τὰς κατ' αὐτῆς ἐκφυείσας αἱρέσεις ἀναθεματίσαντες*; (*c*) it had decreed certain canons.† This letter must be read in

* Mansi, vi. 957.

† *Ibid.* iii. 557. The whole letter may be conveniently given in a footnote.

Τῷ εὐσεβεστάτῳ βασιλεῖ Θεοδοσίῳ ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῶν ἐκ διαφόρων ἐπαρχιῶν συνελθόντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει.

Ἀρχὴ μὲν ἡμῖν τοῦ πρὸς τὴν σὴν εὐσέβειαν γράμματος, εὐχαριστία πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ἀναδείξαντα τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐσεβείας τὴν βασιλείαν, ἐπὶ κοινῇ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τῆς ὑγιοῦς πίστεως στηριγμῷ· ἀποδιδόντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐχαριστίαν, ἀναγκαίως καὶ τὰ γεγενημένα κατὰ τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον πρὸς τὴν σὴν εὐσέβειαν ἀναφέρομεν· καὶ ὅτι συνελθόντες εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν κατὰ τὸ γράμμα τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας, πρῶτον μὲν ἀνενεωσάμεθα τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὁμόνοιαν· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ συντόμους ὅρους ἐξεφωνήσαμεν, τήν τε τῶν πατέρων πίστιν τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ κυρώσαντες, καὶ τὰς κατ' αὐτῆς ἐκφυείσας αἱρέσεις ἀναθεματίσαντες. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐταξίας τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ῥητοὺς κανόνας ὡρίσαμεν· ἅπερ ἅπαντα τῷδε ἡμῶν τῷ γράμματι ὑπετάξαμεν. δεόμεθα τοίνυν τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας ἐπικυρωθῆναι τῆς συνόδου τὴν ψῆφον· ἵν' ὥσπερ τοῖς τῆς κλήσεως γράμμασι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τετίμηκας, οὕτω καὶ τῶν δοξάντων ἐπισφραγίσῃς τὸ τέλος. ὁ δὲ Κύριος στηρίξῃ σου τὴν βασιλείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ παραπέμψῃ γενεαῖς γενεῶν, καὶ προσθείῃ τῷ ἐπιγείῳ κράτει καὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῆς ἐπουρανίου τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν· ἐῤῥωμένον σε, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς καλοῖς διαπρέποντα ὁ Θεὸς χαρίσαιτο τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, εὐχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων, τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς εὐσεβέστατον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον βασιλέα.

connexion with the Epistle of the Council of 382 to Damasus and others, which stated that for the proof of their orthodoxy it was sufficient for them to refer to the tome from Antioch, and to a similar formulary, *πέρυσιν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει παρὰ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκτεθέντι συνόδου· ἐν οἷς πλατύτερον τὴν πίστιν ὡμολογήσαμεν καὶ τῶν ἔναγχος καινοτομηθεισῶν αἱρέσεων ἀναθεματισμὸν ἔγγραφον πεποιήκαμεν.** Now the first Constantinopolitan canon exactly answers to the confirmation of the Nicene faith, and the anathematization of heresies referred to in these words. But what was "the more expanded confession of the faith"? May it not have been the revised Creed of Jerusalem, presented perhaps to the notice of the Council by Cyril (as Dr. Hort has suggested), defended by Gregory of Nyssa,† and so entered upon the Acts, and apparently stamped with the Council's approval? Cyril's see was the most venerable in Christendom, but he himself had long been under Western suspicion as decidedly inclined to Semiarianism, both as a nominee of Acacius and as a friend of Meletius; while it appears from a further passage in the letter just cited that the Council was determined to vindicate his orthodoxy, ranking him with Nectarius of Constantinople and Flavian of Antioch, and describing him as *τὸν αἰδεσιμώτατον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον Κύριλλον . . . πλεῖστα πρὸς τοὺς Ἀρειανοὺς ἐν διαφόροις τόποις ἀθλήσαντα.* The simplest way of effecting their purpose, and probably the best and most natural way that would occur to an assembly of bishops in that age of conciliar creeds, would be to give the sanction of their approval to Cyril's creed. In this way we can account easily and reasonably

* Theod. H.E. v. 9.

† Comp. Niceph-Callist. H.E. xii. 13.

for the tradition which locally connected that creed with Constantinople and the 150 fathers of 381, a tradition which "does not seem likely to have been a mere invention." *

At Chalcedon, as we have seen, it was accepted with acclamations in the second session, and was subsequently in the fifth session inserted in the Council's *Definitio Fidei*, because of its valuable teaching on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

The causes of its ultimate displacement of the Nicene Symbol are not far to seek. The one was elaborately constructed to meet a special want, and its anathemas rendered it unsuitable for popular ecclesiastical uses: the other, both in stateliness of rhythm and in fulness of doctrinal statement, is superior to the Nicene and eminently suited for liturgical recitation.

We now proceed to comment on such clauses in this Creed as have not been remarked upon in the previous notes upon the Nicene.

τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον τὸ Κύριον τὸ Ζωοποιόν.

A triad of epithets is here employed to emphasize the real Deity of the Spirit. He is declared to be different from all other Spirits as One Who is Holy, Divinely Sovereign, and Life-giving.

τὸ Ἅγιον. Comp. John xiv. 26. This epithet expresses the essential characteristic of the Divine Spirit. He is personally and intrinsically Perfect (Hort on 1 Peter i. 15) as God (Lev. xi. 44, 45), and the governing principle of His revelation and dispensation is holiness—that is, perfection (Matt. v. 48; Heb. vi. 1).

* Hort, p. 75.

τὸ Κύριον=יהוה of the Old Testament: compare 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18, *ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστιν . . . μεταμορφούμεθα καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος* (="as from a Divinely-Sovereign Spirit"). *Τὸ Κύριον* is thus decisive against the Macedonian position that the Spirit was "not only a creature, but one of the ministering spirits, differing from the angels only in degree"; Athan. Ep. ad Serap. i. 1. Cyril of Jerusalem evidently had this heresy in his mind when he wrote Catech. iv. 16, *οὗ καὶ χρείαν ἔχουσι θρόνοι καὶ κυριότητες ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι*: and again, xvi. 23, where he speaks of the Spirit as *ἐπιστάτης καὶ διδάσκαλος* of all the spiritual hosts, *καὶ τὰ μέν ἐστιν εἰς λειτουργίαν ἀποστελλόμενα, τὸ δὲ ἐρευνᾳ καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

τὸ Ζωοποιόν, "Life-giving," not merely "life-transmitting." The Spirit is *ζωοποιόν* because He is Himself Life, Rom. viii. 2, *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ζωῆς*. This epithet, like the others, is Scriptural (John vi. 63; 2 Cor. iii. 6), and is thus explained by Athanasius (ad Serap. i. 23), *τὰ δὲ κτίσματα . . . . ζωοποιούμενά ἐστι δι' αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ μὴ μέτεχον ζωῆς ἀλλ' αὐτὸ μετεχόμενον καὶ ζωοποιοῦν τὰ κτίσματα, ποίαν ἔχει συγγένειαν πρὸς τὰ γενητά, ἢ πῶς ὅλως ἂν εἴη τῶν κτισμάτων, ἅπερ ἐν ἐκείνῳ παρὰ τοῦ Λόγου ζωοποιεῖται;* This epithet is also Cyrilline, Catech. vii. 16, xvi. 12.

The Holy Spirit is Life-giving in Creation, giving and sustaining life and order and beauty: in human history, moulding the character and shaping the destiny of individuals, nations, and races: in grace, first imparting spiritual life, and then renewing and strengthening it. Hence He is termed "Creator Spiritus" (comp. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 225 f.). But although Scriptural, neither these epithets nor the phrase which follows are strictly technical for the Spirit is *ὁμοούσιον* with the

Father and the Son. Comp. Athan. c. Apoll. i. 9, *ὁμοούσιος γὰρ ἡ Τριάς*: ad Serap. i. 27. Probably the word *ὁμοούσιον* was felt, when the Macedonian controversy arose, to be too closely attached to the doctrine of the Second Person to be used again with wisdom. Yet Damasus (apud Theod. H.E. v. 11) used the phrase "of one and the same essence (*μιᾶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας*) with the Father and the Son": and later it became the usual term: *e.g.* Epiph. Haer. 74; Invocation in Lit. of St. Mark (Brightman, i. 134); Creed of Charisius, Hahn, p. 319. The doctrine of the co-essential Trinity had been clearly stated by Tertullian adv. Prax. 2, "Tres autem non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie; unius autem substantiae," etc.

ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον. As, in the language of Scripture which is followed in the technical confessions of the Church, the relation of the Son to the Father is described by the term "generation," so that of the Spirit is that of "procession," both being ineffable eternal relations. The phrase combines 1 Cor. ii. 12 with John xv. 26: it is frequent in Athanasius, ad Serap. i. 15, 20, 22, 25; iii. 2.

ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός has the same force here as when used of the Son; that is, it denotes co-essentiality. The Son is *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα*: the Spirit *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον.* There was a difficulty felt on the subject of this nomenclature, and Athanasius himself unconsciously stated it in arguing for the Sonship of the Logos, Orat. c. Ar. iv. 15, *εἰ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔστιν, διὰ τί μὴ συνορῶσιν ὅτι τὸ ἔκ τινος ὑπάρχον υἱός ἐστιν ἐκείνου ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἔστιν;* This would involve the Spirit being also "Son" because *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός.* The Arians seized upon

the point, and were rebuked (ad Serap. i. 15–17) on the ground that speculation was irreverent.

The temporal mission of the Spirit is not referred to in this Creed, though it finds a place in Tertullian, de praescr. haer. 13, "misisse vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti qui credentes aget"; adv. Prax. 2, "Qui exinde miserit secundum promissionem suam a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum."

On the "Filioque" addition in the West, see detached note, page 88.

τὸ σὺν Π. καὶ Υ. συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον.

This clause cannot be traced to any earlier Creed that has been preserved; but the diction resembles that of Athanasius ad Serap. i. 31, *τὸ συνδοξαζόμενον Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ καὶ θεολογούμενον μετὰ τοῦ Λόγου*: ad Iov. *ad fin.* *συνεδόξασαν αὐτὸ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ.* The resemblance to the language of the Creed found in the common text of Cyril Catech. iv. 16 disappears in the critical text of Reischl.

The idea underlying this clause is that the association of the Spirit with the Father and Son in equal worship and doxology exhibited the constant Christian belief in His co-essential Deity. The lex adorandi expressed the lex credendi. The same association is found in the Baptismal formula, Matt. xxviii. 19; in the Apostolic benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 4: comp. the Ter Sanctus of the Triumphal Hymn, Isa. vi. 2; Rev. iv. 1–8. On the "Gloria Patri" see Basil. de Sp. Sancto, 4, 73. Somewhat similarly an anonymous writer, probably Hippolytus or Gaius, apud Euseb. H.E., v. 28, had appealed to the devotional hymnody of the Church as testifying to the

Deity of Christ. On the value of liturgical formularies as preservative of the truth, see Bull. Serm. 13, "The ancient Liturgies were so framed that they were a kind of systems of orthodox divinity and antidotes against heresy," etc.

τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. This clause expresses the Scriptural teaching on the inspiration of "holy men of God" (2 Peter i. 21). It thus unites the old Dispensation with the new, showing that there was no such antagonism between them as Marcion held, but that it was the same Spirit of God Who spake in times past through the prophets (Heb. i. 1) Who now, as the Vicar of Christ, speaks through the Church to the hearts and consciences of Christians; comp. too Mark xiii. 11.

εἰς μίαν . . . ἐκκλησίαν. Following a group of clauses introduced by *καὶ* (implying *πιστεύομεν*), another *καὶ* would have been natural here, especially as the clause is not grouped under *ὁμολογοῦμεν* (Hort); but it is certainly contrary to the structure of this Creed to read these words in construction with *λαλῆσαν* (as Ffoulkes, following Valetta, in D. C. B. ii. 448). Such a construction is found, however, in the Creed of the Apost. Const. and in that of Seleucia (Socr. ii. 40, Ath. de syn. 29). A clause referring to the Church was customary in early creeds: *e.g.* Cyprian Epist. 70, 76; Arius and Euzoius, Socr. i. 26; Marcellus, Epiphan. Haer. 52; early Creed of Jerusalem (but after *εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα, κ.τ.λ.*); and Tertullian alludes to some recognition of the Church in the creed (de bapt. 6, 11), although he does not give it a place in the Rules of Faith which he sets out at length.

It is remarkable that the Latin version (followed by

our English) has ignored εἰς, and reads "et unam sanctam," etc., without any Greek authority. The preposition here, as in the first opening of the creed, is important: it denotes the transfer of confidence from the individual self to the corporate society, the organism of which the Christian forms a part, and in which alone he finds his true life. It is a protest against "individualism."

The word ἐκκλησία was employed by the Greek translators to represent the Hebrew word which denoted the gathering together of the representative heads of the people of Israel, "the assembly." It is thus associated in Biblical Greek, as in classical, with a "calling out" from a larger body, and "assembling together." The use of the word in Stephen's apology (Acts vii. 38) of "the ancient congregation of Israel" gives the key to its transferred use, general in the N.T., of the Christian congregation, the true Israel of God (Hort, Christ. Ecclesia, pp. 3 foll.).

This clause εἰς μίαν . . . ἐκκλησίαν and the following ones are placed in the third division of the Creed under the Article dealing with the Holy Spirit, because the Church is now living under His Dispensation, and from Him draws all her life and powers of grace. We may note in the history of Revelation three Dispensations:—1, that of God, simply; in the Old Testament; 2, that of the Son, during Christ's Life on earth; 3, that of the Spirit, since the Day of Pentecost.

The four "notes" or inward characteristics of the Church here given are Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity. The first and fourth are originally peculiar to Eastern creeds. The second alone finds place in the Cyprianic Creed and that of Marcellus. The third first occurs in a creed (after appearing in the Nicene anathe-

mas) in that of Arius and Euzoius (328), then in the early Jerusalem Creed (along with the first and second), the Apost. Const. (along with the second and fourth), but not in a Western Creed until about the year 400 (see the Creed of Nicetas of Rometiana in Hahn, p. 49).*

We may now examine them separately.

μίαν. Strictly speaking, the Unity of the Church is necessarily an invisible Unity, since the greater number of its members have already passed beyond the vail. The Unity is that of the One Body of Christ, quickened by the One Spirit (Eph. iv. 4–6).

"One Family we dwell in Him,
One Church, above, beneath."

The language of the Creed is often quoted as though it referred solely to the external unity of that portion of the Church which is visible because "militant here on earth"; but it is at least questionable whether this thought falls within the horizon of the Creed. The Western Church at a later time explicitly excluded this interpretation of the clause "The Holy Catholic Church" in the Apostles' Creed by adding in apposition to it the words "The Communion of Saints"—the spiritual fellowship, that is, of the seen and unseen, wherein we are united with all the Saints of all the times, now in our actual present position as part of a spiritual host in the spiritual Kingdom of God.†

* With these "notes" may be compared the three characteristics of "the Visible Church of Christ" given in Article XIX.; and the points enumerated in Acts ii. 41, 42—Baptism, Apostles' doctrine (opposed to heresy), the *κοινωνία* (opposed to schism), the Breaking of the Bread (Holy Communion), the Prayers (Public Worship).

† Some excellent thoughts upon the Unity of the Visible Church will be found in Lecture vi. of F. W. Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome.* On other interpretations of "Sanctorum Communio," see Zahn, *Apostles' Creed*, Engl. transl. pp. 188 ff.

In the English version of the Creed, made in 1549 and repeated in succeeding Prayer Books, the omission of the word "One" in this clause was probably due to the defectiveness of the Latin texts which were consulted (see *Church Quarterly Review*, viii. 372).

ἁγίαν. The Holiness of the Church is a necessary consequence of its constitution: it is the Body of Christ and the Temple of His Spirit. Thus, notwithstanding grave defects in the individual members, St. Paul addressed his letters to the "holy ones" (*ἁγίοις*) in the various churches of Corinth, Rome, Philippi, Ephesus, and Colossae. Comp. Acts ix. 32; Jude 3.

καθολικήν. This epithet is thus explained by Cyril: *Καθολικὴ μὲν οὖν καλεῖται διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης εἶναι τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπὸ περάτων γῆς ἕως περάτων· καὶ διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν καθολικῶς καὶ ἀνελλιπῶς ἅπαντα τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐλθεῖν ὀφείλοντα δόγματα περί τε ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων πραγμάτων, ἐπιουρανίων τε καὶ ἐπιγείων, καὶ διὰ τὸ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων εἰς εὐσέβειαν ὑποτάσσειν, ἀρχόντων τε καὶ ἀρχομένων, λογίων τε καὶ ἰδιωτῶν· καὶ διὰ τὸ καθολικῶς ἰατρεύειν μὲν καὶ θεραπεύειν ἅπαν τὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν εἶδος τῶν διὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐπιτελουμένων, κεκτῆσθαι δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ὀνομαζομένης ἀρετῆς ἐν ἔργοις τε καὶ λόγοις καὶ πνευματικοῖς παντοίοις χαρίσμασιν* (Catech. xviii. 23). The original ecclesiastical use of the word is to denote "universal," "general," as opposed to "particular." So Ignatius, Smyrn. 8 (church); Just. Mart. Dial. 82 and Theoph. ad Autol. i. 13 (resurrection); Epist. Smyrn. Poly. mart. (church). Thus it became easy for it to be used as a definite epithet for the orthodox body distinct from local schisms, and so to denote that

organism which preserved the truth distinct from heresy. Examples of this sense will be found Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 106, 107; and in Latin in the Murator. frag. (Lightfoot, Ignatius, ii. 310). Comp. Pacian. ad Symp. *passim;* August. de civ. Dei, xiii. 12, "Universa ecclesia ex multis constat ecclesiis."

ἀποστολικήν. Primarily this epithet denotes the "mission" of the Church into the world, John xx. 21; but other reasons for its use are not to be excluded. The Church is built on the Apostles (Eph. ii. 20); it dates from their days, and preserves their doctrine, and continues their ministry. Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 108, *μία γὰρ ἡ πάντων γέγονε τῶν ἀποστόλων ὥσπερ διδασκαλία, οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἡ παράδοσις.* So Tertullian in a useful passage de praescr. haer. 20, "The Apostles founded churches, others received the faith from these: itaque tot ac tantae ecclesiae una est illa ab apostolis prima ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primae et omnes apostolicae," etc.

ἓν βαπτίσμα. The earlier Jerusalem Creed, no doubt under the influence of Mark i. 4 and parallels, added *μετανοίας*, which also stood in the shorter Baptismal confession. The word was no doubt omitted in the revision as tending to limit unduly the idea of Christian baptism. John's was the baptism of repentance only (Acts xix. 4); Christ's is also a baptism of regeneration (Matt. iii. 11): comp. Basil. de Sp. Sancto, 36. Ambrose in Luc. ii., "aliud fuit baptisma paenitentiae, aliud gratiae est" (quoted by Swete on Mark i. 4). The phrase *ἓν βαπτίσμα* comes from Eph. iv. 4, and denotes One and Same Baptism into the Name of the Blessed Trinity, whereby all are admitted into the One Body. The

iteration of the spiritual birth is, of course, as impossible as that of the physical birth (John iii. 4), but that is not the point here insisted upon. The distinction between the One Christian baptism and other baptisms—Jewish, Johannine, etc.—is referred to Heb. vi. 2.

εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. The remission of sins necessarily follows from the nature of the sacrament of baptism (Acts ii. 38). The spiritual sphere of existence upon which the believer enters is a sphere of forgiveness, and although acts of sin may be committed they may be daily remitted. "Semel abluimus baptismate, cottidie abluimus oratione" (August. Serm. ad Catech. xv.; cp. de Serm. Dom. lvi. 13). *Ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν* is synonymous with *ἀπολύτρωσις* in Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14. The metaphor in *ἄφεσις* is to be traced to the use of the word in Deut. xv. 1 ff. for the "release" of debts every seventh year; cp. Matt. vi. 12; and *ἐνιαυτὸς ἀφέσεως* of the year of Jubile, Lev. xxv. 10. It must be remembered that there is a further analogy between the spiritual birth and the physical birth besides that of the impossibility of iteration. Neither is a guarantee for freedom from the possibility of disease and death in its own sphere.

προσδοκῶμεν. Compare 2 Peter iii. 12.

ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν. The anarthrous phrase is Pauline, 1 Cor. xv. 21, "a resurrection of dead persons"; that is, the general resurrection, and the form of expression excludes any false notions which might attach to the word *σαρκός* (carnis). Indeed, the phrase, *σαρκὸς ἀνάστασις* (resurrectio carnis), though common in early creeds, occurs nowhere in Scripture, and its unguarded use

amongst Christians gave rise to heathen scoffs and misinterpretations. Cyril avoided it in his Lectures, though it stood in his Creed; xviii. 1, 22, 28. The Aquileian "hujus carnis"* was still more open to misconstruction, although it was really only meant to guard the "identity" of the future resurrection body with the present earthly one. According to St. Paul's illustration this "identity" is analogous to that of the seed and the plant (1 Cor. xv. 36), where the principle of life is continuous, though the outer organism wherein that life manifested itself is changed. The essential identity of the *body* therefore, which even in this life is dependent upon constant change, will be preserved through the changes involved in death and dissolution. "Alter et idem." Luke xxiv. 39.

Christianity knows nothing of the "immortality of the soul" apart from the body. That was a conception of pagan philosophy which is really destructive of the belief in the continuance of our distinct and complete personal existence. The Christian doctrine teaches the restoration of the full personality of the individual which only exists, as we know it, in the vital union of body and soul (cp. Matt. x. 28). *Personal* identity may be held to consist in a fundamental, individualized energy which is gifted with the power of clothing itself with a suitable organism adapted to its environment.

ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. This expression replaces the *ζωὴν αἰώνιον* of the earlier creed, which was also the

* "Hujus carnis" appears also in the Creed of Nicetas of Rometiana or Remesiana (Hahn, p. 49), and in the creed delivered at the traditio symboli on Palm-Sunday in the Mozarabic ritual (Hahn, p. 69). Zahn quotes also Pseudo-Aug. Serm. 242, and Missale Florentinum in Caspari, iv. 302.

general Western form of the article, "vitam aeternam"; but the Apost. Const. and Arius and Euzoius (Soc. i. 26) read, *εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*.

ζωή is essentially independent of time. It comprehends time and transcends it, being in actuality supra-temporal. Eternal life consists in the knowledge of God, "Quem nosse est vivere"—John xvii. 3; 1 John v. 20—advanced, illuminated, and intensified by the beatific vision, 1 John iii. 2. The beginnings of this knowledge may be an actual absolute present possession; yet the time that now is, is embarrassed by limitations—its knowledge is only partial (1 Cor. xiii. 9)—whereas the "coming age" will be one of open vision and freed from all that hampers and obscures (Matt. xii. 32; Luke xviii. 30, xx. 34 f.).

NOTE ON THE CLAUSE "FILIOQUE"

A MOMENTOUS addition to the clause ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον now stands in the Western versions of the Creed, by which the "procession" of the Spirit is stated to be "from the Son" as well as "from the Father." The history of the addition is a little obscure, but the date of its first appearance in a creed can (if the received texts are to be trusted) be fixed exactly.* The third Council of Toletum (Toledo) A.D. 589 was summoned by King Reccared in order that the Visigoths in Spain, who had hitherto professed the Arian faith, might publicly proclaim their renunciation of Arianism and adherence to Catholicity. The Council accordingly recited first the original Creed of Nicaea of 325, and then the "Symbol of the 150" as in the Chalcedonian Definition, but with two additions—(*a*) *Deum de Deo* (= Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ of Nicaea); (*b*) *et Filio* ["a Patre et Filio procedentem"].† No reason can be assigned for these insertions save that they were believed to belong to the true text of the Creed, and were therefore, if not in the exemplar already, either written mechanically by the scribe or inserted

* Doubt as to the genuineness of the Acts of the first Council of Braga in 411 forbids their being appealed to in argument. They represent Bishop Pancratian as making a confession of his faith, which contains the words, "Credo in Spiritum Sanctum procedentem a Patre et Verbo"—which were acceded to by the assembled bishops (Mansi, iv. 287).

† The evidence of the MSS. still requires to be more thoroughly investigated.

because he thought that they ought to be there.* Once inserted, the liturgical use of the Creed made the additions familiar. Nor was the doctrine a new one in the West. Tertullian had given exact expression to the true doctrine, adv. Prax. 4, "Spiritum non aliunde puto quam a Patre per Filium"; *ib.* 8, "Tertius est Spiritus a Deo et Filio; sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice, et tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine, et tertius a sole apex ex radio . . . Ita Trinitas per consertos et connectos gradus a Patri decurrens monarchiae nihil obstrepit." Similarly Hilary of Poitiers, de Trin. xii. 55, 57, had written of the Spirit, "ex Patre per Filium"; while Augustine, Tract. xcix. in Joan. xvi. 7, had been even more distinctly clear on the "Double Procession."

The Spanish orthodox too had adopted it at an earlier Council of Toledo in 447—"The Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten, the Paraclete not begotten, but proceeding from the Father and the Son." The phrase "a Patre Filioque procedens" occurs twice; and there can be little doubt that the reading is correct.†

The controversy between the East and West in the eighth century turned at first upon this doctrine of the procession and not upon the insertion of the Filioque in the Creed, which was apparently not detected until the beginning of the ninth century. Nor would Pope Leo III., while upholding the doctrine, admit the insertion into the Creed at Rome, although pressed by Karl and legates from the

* Dr. Neale (*History of Holy Eastern Church*, Introd. ii. 1153) suggested that her acute controversy with Arianism led "the Spanish Church to dislike the idea that the Father should have an attribute, namely, of producing the Holy Ghost, which the Son had not, and therefore to make the addition to the Constantinopolitan Creed" (Swete, *Hist. of the Doctr. of the Procession of the H. Spirit*, p. 164).

† Hahn, p. 210.

Council of Aachen, A.D. 809, to do so. Thus the Roman Creed remained alone of Western symbols without the addition. Pearson and Neale* hold Nicholas I. (858-867) responsible for the ultimate insertion of the Filioque in the Roman Creed; but whether this be so or not, it was not until two hundred years later that it was popularized at Rome, when Benedict VIII., A.D. 1014, adopted the custom of chanting the Creed in the Liturgy.

The real point in the discussion of the doctrine between East and West turned upon whether the Spirit could be said to proceed from the Son in the same way that He proceeds from the Father. No one maintained this, which would be an infringement of the monarchia.† Tarasius of Constantinople in 787 proclaimed his belief in τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιοῦν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον (Mansi, xii. 1122); and this was really the belief of Easterns and Westerns. The doctrine of the "Double Procession" was probably brought to the English by Augustine from Rome, and was thus naturally held by them from the first. Gregory the Great had taught it explicitly (Moral. i. 22, Hom. in Evang. ii. 26), and it found expression in the Synodal letter of the Council of Haethfelth, 680 (Baed. H.E. iv. 17). Still more emphatic was the action of the Reformers who imported it into the Litany of 1544 and into the Articles of 1563 (Article V., taken from the Conf. of Würtemberg, A.D. 1522).

That the doctrine is as implicitly taught in Scripture as that of the Trinity, an examination of the following texts will show:—

1 Cor. ii. 12: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

* Pearson, Art. viii., p. 576; Neale, *op. cit.*, p. 1167.

† Tertullian had argued this point expressly, adv. Prax. 4.

John xv. 26: ὁ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται.

Matt. x. 20: τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν.

Rom. viii. 9, 10: πνεῦμα Θεοῦ . . . πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (synonymous).

Gal. iv. 6: τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Phil. i. 19: τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

1 Peter i. 11: τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ.

Acts xvi. 17: τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ.

Compare John xv. 26: ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ Πατρός: xvi. 14, ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται: xx. 23, Λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον, on which Augustine comments, "Quid enim aliud significavit illa insufflatio nisi quod procedat Spiritus Sanctus et de Ipso?" And again, "Insufflando significavit Spiritum Sanctum non Patris solius esse Spiritum, sed et suum" (Tract. xcix. in Joan. xvi. 13; *ib.* cxxi. 4).

Compare too John xiv. 16, 17: ὁ Πατὴρ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα ᾖ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. . . . Ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς: Matt. xxviii. 20, Ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμὶ . . . ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. So that we may say that the Spirit as truly represents the Son as the Son represents the Father (John xiv. 9). Thus Cyril argued the Divine Personality of Christ from the fact that the Spirit was Christ's Own; Epist. 3 ad Nest., Anath. 9; comp. Apol. adv. Theod. 9; contr. Nest. iv. 1. Cyril's belief in the "Double Procession" was clear (see the passages cited by Swete, p. 143 f., and by Pusey, p. 130); but in the Nestorian controversy he declined to be drawn off from the main point at issue by Theodoret's explicit denial of the procession from the Son. The chief thing Cyril insisted upon was His mission from the Son, but even this was involved to a certain degree with His essential relation to the Son.

On the whole subject see Swete, *op. cit.*, and Pusey, A Letter on the clause "And the Son" in the Nicene Creed, 1876.*

* Both these works were reviewed in the *Church Quarterly Review* iii. 421 foll.

VIII. CREEDS OF EPIPHANIUS

A. THE SHORTER FORM

Ancoratus 118.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα
ποιητὴν οὐρανου τε καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων·
καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν,
τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ
τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνιων,
τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός,
Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός,
Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα,
ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί,
δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ·
τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν
κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν,
καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου,
καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,
σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου,
καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα,
καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,
καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς,

καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός,
καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος·
καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν,
τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,
τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνουμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον,
τὸ λαλησᾶν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν·
εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν.
ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν·
προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν
καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰώνος.
Ἀμήν.

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας Ἦν ποτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, ἢ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι ῥευστὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Υἱὸν, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

B. THE LONGER FORM

Ancoratus 119.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ἀοράτων τε καὶ ὁρατῶν ποιητήν·
καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
γεννηθέντα ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ
τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός
Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ,
γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα
ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί
δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὁρατά τε καὶ ἀόρατα.

τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα, τουτέστι γεννηθέντα τελείως ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας τῆς ἀειπαρθένου διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου,

ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, τουτέστι τελείον ἄνθρωπον λαβόντα, ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα καὶ νοῦν καὶ πάντα, εἴ τι ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, οὐκ ἀπὸ σπέρματος ἀνδρὸς, οὐδὲ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, ἀλλ' εἰς ἑαυτὸν σάρκα ἀναπλάσαντα εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν ἑνότητα· οὐ καθάπερ ἐν προφήταις ἐνέπνευσέ τε καὶ ἐλάλησε καὶ ἐνήργησεν, ἀλλὰ τελείως ἐνανθρωπήσαντα (ὁ γὰρ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, οὐ τροπὴν ὑποστὰς οὐδὲ μεταβαλὼν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεότητα εἰς ἀνθρωπότητα), εἰς μίαν συνενώσαντα ἑαυτοῦ ἁγίαν τελειότητά τε καὶ θεότητα (εἷς γάρ ἐστι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ οὐ δύο, ὁ αὐτὸς Θεός, ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος, ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεύς).

παθόντα δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν σαρκί,

καὶ ἀναστάντα καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς ουρανοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι

ἐνδόξως καθίσαντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρός,

ἐρχόμενον ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σώματι ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,

οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος·

καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα πιστεύομεν,

τὸ λαλῆσαν ἐν νόμῳ καὶ κηρῦξαν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις καὶ καταβὰν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην, λαλοῦν ἐν ἀποστόλοις, οἰκοῦν ἐν ἁγίοις·

οὕτως δὲ πιστεύομεν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐστὶν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, Πνεῦμα τέλειον, Πνεῦμα παράκλητον, ἄκτιστον,

ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ
λαμβανόμενον καὶ πιστευόμενον
πιστεύομεν εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν
καὶ εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας,
καὶ εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ κρίσιν δικαίαν ψυχῶν
καὶ σωμάτων,
καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ὅτι ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν ὁ Υἱὸς ἢ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ἢ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποσάσεως ἢ οὐσίας, φάσκοντας εἶναι τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία, ἡ μήτηρ ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν· καὶ πάλιν ἀναθεματίζομεν τοὺς μὴ ὁμολογοῦντας ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ πάσας τὰς αἱρέσεις τὰς μὴ ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως οὔσας.

THE EPISTLES OF CYRIL

II. AND III. TO NESTORIUS AND TO JOHN OF ANTIOCH

Tu Rex Gloriae, Christe,
Tu Patris Sempiternus es Filius.

Tu ad Liberandum Mundum Suscepisti Hominem
Non Horruisti Virginis Uterum.

THE EPISTLES OF CYRIL

INTRODUCTION

The circumstances which led to the intervention of Cyril in the Nestorian controversy must be briefly told.

After the death of Sisinnius, at the close of the year 427, Nestorius, a priest of Antioch and pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia, was consecrated in April, 428, to the see of Constantinople. He took with him from Antioch a domestic chaplain (syncellus) named Anastasius, who was an ardent disciple of Theodore's teaching and methods of thought.* In one of his Advent sermons upon the Incarnation Anastasius decried the Catholic practice of calling the Virgin Mary "Theotokos" — *Θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν καλείτω μηδείς· Μαρία γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἦν· ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου δὲ Θεὸν τεχθῆναι ἀδύνατον* (Socr. vii. 32).

This teaching Nestorius publicly approved, and he himself preached a course of sermons in which he drew a plain distinction between the man Jesus, born of Mary, and the Son of God Who dwelt in him.† Eusebius, a lawyer, afterwards Bishop of Dorylaeum, led the Catholic opposition to this erroneous doctrine, and denounced Nestorius as a heretic, refuting him by his own creed

* On the widespread influence of Theodore and his responsibility for Nestorianism and Pelagianism, see the *Church Quarterly Review*, i. 115 foll.

† These sermons are extant in a Latin version made by Marius Mercator.

(see above, p. 67). Marius Mercator at the same time published a tract against Nestorius; but neither he nor Eusebius accurately grasped the vital point of the heresy. They treated it as if Trinitarian (Paulianist or Photinian) instead of Christological. Nestorius never denied the Personality of the Word: he did deny that the Word really became Flesh.

Nestorius' sermons soon began to circulate at Rome and in Aegypt, particularly amongst the monks. Cyril, in his Paschal homily for Easter 429, written early in January, took occasion to dwell upon the Unity of Christ's Person, and the doctrinal value of the Virgin's title of Theotokos; and when his attention was especially drawn to the mischief which Nestorius' sermons were doing, he issued an encyclical letter to the Monks of Aegypt in which he stated the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, carefully distinguishing the abstract Deity from the concrete Person of the Word Who, Himself unchanged, took Flesh.

This encyclical reached Nestorius in Constantinople and kindled his keen resentment against Cyril, whom he proceeded to calumniate. Meanwhile Pope Caelestine, into whose hands Nestorius' sermons had come, wrote to Cyril asking if they were really productions of Nestorius. Upon this Cyril wrote to Nestorius, urging him to restore peace by employing the term Theotokos (Epist. ad Nestor. 1). Nestorius' reply was simply evasive; but he now took the opportunity of writing to Caelestine respecting four Pelagian bishops at Constantinople, and ending his letter with an attack upon the Catholics who called the Virgin Theotokos. On receipt of this letter and the tracts which accompanied it Caelestine employed Cassian to refute Nestorius, which he did in Seven books on the

Incarnation. Meanwhile Cyril had received from his agents at Constantinople copies of further Nestorian writings, and also learnt the names of his calumniators, who turned out to be certain Alexandrians who had been convicted for various crimes. Hereupon, in February, 430, he wrote his Second Letter to Nestorius, which now follows (Epist. ad Nest. 2, "Obloquuntur").

ANALYSIS OF CYRIL'S SECOND LETTER TO NESTORIUS

A. *Introduction.* Injurious reports about me are being circulated by unworthy persons, whom God will judge.

Let me remind you to hold fast and teach the true faith, lest you cause any to stumble.

B. *Doctrinal.* The meaning of the Nicene Faith in the Incarnation:—not conversion of the Godhead into flesh, or into a whole man; but by a Personal Union to soul and flesh the WORD became MAN, the two different Natures, Godhead and Manhood, retaining their diversity, yet uniting to make One Lord and Christ and Son.

Hence the Word has two generations—

Begotten before the ages of the Father,

Begotten also, after the flesh, of the Virgin;

not a mere man upon whom the Word descended, but the Word Himself born in His Human Nature.

Thus God suffered and died and rose again, not in His Godhead, but in His Manhood.

So we worship One Christ, not a man along with (σύν) the Word.

To reject this Hypostatic Union is to make Two Sons.

It was not a union of the Word to a human person, but the Word became flesh; *i.e.* He partook of our flesh and blood, yet still remained God. This is the teaching of catholicity and antiquity.

Thus the Virgin is Theotokos, not the bearer of the Godhead, but of the body and soul which were personally united to the Word.

C. *Conclusion.* Do you so think and teach, and preserve peace to all.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ

ΚΥΡΙΛΛΟΥ

ΠΡΟΣ ΝΕΣΤΟΡΙΟΝ

Τῷ εὐλαβεστάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ συλλειτουργῷ Νεστορίῳ Κύριλλος ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν

ΚΑΤΑΦΛΥΑΡΟΥΣΙ μὲν, ὡς μανθάνω, τινὲς τῆς ἐμῆς ὑπολήψεως ἐπὶ τῆς σῆς θεοσεβείας· καὶ τοῦτο συχνῶς, τὰς τῶν ἐν τέλει συνόδους καιροφυλακοῦντες μάλιστα, καὶ τάχα που καὶ τέρπειν οἰόμενοι τὴν σὴν ἀκοήν· καὶ ἀβουλήτους πέμπουσι φωνὰς, ἠδικημένοι μὲν οὐδὲν, ἐλεγχθέντες δὲ καὶ τοῦτο χρηστῶς· ὁ μὲν, ὅτι τυφλοὺς ἠδίκει καὶ πένητας· ὁ δὲ, ὡς μητρὶ ξίφος ἐπανατείνας· ὁ δὲ, θεραπαίνῃ συγκεκλοφὼς χρυσίον ἀλλότριον, καὶ τοιαύτην ἐσχηκὼς ἀεὶ τὴν ὑπόληψιν, ἣν οὐκ ἂν εὔξαιτό τις συμβῆναί τισι καὶ τῶν λίαν ἐχθρῶν. πλὴν οὐ πολὺς τῶν τοιούτων ὁ λόγος ἐμοὶ, ἵνα μήτε ὑπὲρ τὸν δεσπότην καὶ διδάσκαλον, μήτε μὴν ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας τὸ τῆς ἐνούσης ἐμοὶ βραχύτητος ἐκτείνοιμι μέτρον. οὐ γὰρ ἐνδέχεται τὰς τῶν φαύλων διαδράναι σκαιότητας, ὡς ἂν ἕλοιτό τις διαβιοῦν. Rom. iii. 14. ἀλλ᾽ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας μεστὸν ἔχοντες τὸ στόμα, τῷ πάντων ἀπολογήσονται Κριτῇ· τετράψομαι δὲ πάλιν ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸ ὅτι μάλιστα πρέπον ἐμαυτῷ, καὶ ὑπομνήσω καὶ νῦν, ὡς ἀδελφὸν ἐν Χριστῷ, τῆς διδασκαλίας τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει φρόνημα μετὰ πάσης ἀσφαλείας ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς Matt. xviii. 6. τοὺς λαούς· ἐννοεῖν τε ὅτι τὸ σκανδαλίσαι καὶ

μόνον ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς Χριστὸν, ἀφόρητον ἔχει τὴν ἀγανάκτησιν· εἰ δὲ δὴ πληθὺς εἴη τοσαύτη τῶν λελυπημένων, πῶς οὐχ ἁπάσης εὐτεχνίας ἐν χρείᾳ καθεστήκαμεν, πρός γε τὸ δεῖν ἐμφρόνως περιελεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα, καὶ τὸν ὑγιᾶ τῆς πίστεως κατευρύναι λόγον τοῖς ζητοῦσι τὸ ἀληθές; ἔσται δὲ τοῦτο καὶ μάλα ὀρθῶς, εἰ τοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων περιτυγχάνοντες λόγοις, περὶ πολλοῦ τε αὐτοὺς ποιεῖσθαι σπουδάζοιμεν, καὶ δοκιμάζοντες ἑαυτοὺς, εἰ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῇ πίστει, κατὰ τὸ 2 Cor. xiii. 5. γεγραμμένον, ταῖς ἐκείνων ὀρθαῖς καὶ ἀνεπιλήπτοις δόξαις τὰς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐννοίας εὖ μάλα συμπλάττοιμεν.

Ἔφη τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία καὶ μεγάλη σύνοδος, αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς κατὰ φύσιν γεννηθέντα Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ φωτὸς, τὸν δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν ὁ Πατὴρ, κατελθεῖν, σαρκωθῆναι, ἐνανθρωπῆσαι, παθεῖν, ἀναστῆναι τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθεῖν εἰς οὐρανούς. τούτοις καὶ ἡμᾶς ἕπεσθαι δεῖ καὶ τοῖς λόγοις καὶ τοῖς δόγμασιν, ἐννοοῦντας τί τὸ σαρκωθῆναι καὶ ἐνανθρωπῆσαι δηλοῖ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον· οὐ γάρ φαμεν, ὅτι ἡ τοῦ Λόγου φύσις μεταποιηθεῖσα γέγονε σὰρξ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὅτι εἰς ὅλον ἄνθρωπον μετεβλήθη, τὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος· ἐκεῖνο δὲ μᾶλλον, ὅτι σάρκα ἐψυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ ἑνώσας ὁ Λόγος ἑαυτῷ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἀφράστως τε καὶ ἀπερινοήτως, γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος καὶ κεχρημάτικεν υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, οὐ κατὰ θέλησιν μόνην ἢ εὐδοκίαν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὡς ἐν προσλήψει προσώπου μόνου· καὶ ὅτι διάφοροι μὲν αἱ πρὸς ἑνότητα τὴν ἀληθινὴν συνενεχθεῖσαι φύσεις, εἷς δὲ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν Χριστὸς καὶ Υἱός· οὐχ ὡς τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, ἀποτελεσασῶν δὲ μᾶλλον ἡμῖν τὸν ἕνα Κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ Υἱὸν θεότητός τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, διὰ τῆς ἀφράστου καὶ ἀποῤῥήτου πρὸς ἑνότητα συνδρομῆς. οὕτω τε λέγεται, καίτοι πρὸ αἰώνων ἔχων τὴν ὕπαρξιν καὶ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ Πατρὸς,

γεννηθῆναι καὶ κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ γυναικὸς, οὐχ ὡς τῆς θείας αὐτοῦ φύσεως ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι λαβούσης ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ παρθένῳ, οὔτε μὴν δεηθείσης ἀναγκαίως δι' ἑαυτὴν δευτέρας γεννήσεως μετὰ τὴν ἐκ Πατρός· ἔστι γὰρ εἰκαῖόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀμαθὲς τὸν ὑπάρχοντα πρὸ παντὸς αἰῶνος καὶ συναΐδιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δεῖσθαι λέγειν ἀρχῆς τῆς εἰς τὸ εἶναι δευτέρας· ἐπειδὴ Nic. Symb. δὲ "δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν" ἑνώσας ἑαυτῷ ὁ Λόγος καθ' ὑπόστασιν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, προῆλθεν ἐκ γυναικὸς, ταύτῃτοι λέγεται γεννηθῆναι σαρκικῶς. οὐ γὰρ πρῶτον ἄνθρωπος ἐγεννήθη κοινὸς ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου, εἶθ' οὕτω καταπεφοίτηκεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὁ Λόγος· ἀλλ' ἐξ αὐτῆς μήτρας ἑνωθεὶς, ὑπομεῖναι λέγεται γέννησιν σαρκικὴν, ὡς τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς τὴν γέννησιν οἰκειούμενος. οὕτω φαμὲν αὐτὸν καὶ παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι· οὐχ ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου παθόντος εἰς ἰδίαν φύσιν ἢ πληγὰς ἢ διατρήσεις ἥλων ἤγουν τὰ ἕτερα τῶν τραυμάτων· ἀπαθὲς γὰρ τὸ θεῖον ὅτι καὶ ἀσώματον· ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸ γεγονὸς αὐτοῦ ἴδιον σῶμα πέπονθε, ταῦτα πάλιν αὐτὸς λέγεται παθεῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἀπαθὴς ἐν τῷ πάσχοντι σώματι. κατὰ τὸν ἴσον δὲ τρόπον καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τεθνάναι νοοῦμεν. ἀθάνατος μὲν γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν καὶ ἄφθαρτος καὶ ζωὴ καὶ ζωοποιός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος· ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸ ἴδιον Heb. ii. 9. αὐτοῦ πάλιν σῶμα χάριτι Θεοῦ, καθά φησιν ὁ Παῦλος, ὑπὲρ παντὸς ἐγεύσατο θανάτου, λέγεται παθεῖν αὐτὸς τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν θάνατον· οὐχ ὡς εἰς πεῖραν ἐλθὼν τοῦ θανάτου, τό γε ἧκον εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ φύσιν· ἀποπληξία γὰρ τοῦτο λέγειν ἢ φρονεῖν· ἀλλ' ὅτι, καθάπερ ἔφην ἀρτίως, ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ ἐγεύσατο θανάτου. οὕτω καὶ ἐγηγερμένης αὐτοῦ τῆς σαρκὸς, πάλιν ἡ ἀνάστασις αὐτοῦ λέγεται, οὐχ ὡς πεσόντος εἰς φθοράν· μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἐγήγερται σῶμα. οὕτω Χριστὸν ἕνα καὶ Κύριον ὁμολογήσομεν, οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνοῦντες τῷ Λόγῳ, ἵνα μὴ τομῆς φαντασία παρεισκρίνηται, διὰ τοῦ λέγειν τό Σύν·

ἀλλ' ὡς ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν προσκυνοῦντες, ὅτι μὴ ἀλλότριον τοῦ Λόγου τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, μεθ' οὗ καὶ αὐτὸς συνεδρεύει τῷ Πατρί· οὐχ ὡς δύο πάλιν συνεδρευόντων υἱῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑνὸς καθ' ἕνωσιν μετὰ τῆς σαρκός. ἐὰν δὲ τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσιν ἢν ὡς ἀνέφικτον ἢ ὡς ἀκαλλῆ παραιτώμεθα, ἐμπίπτομεν εἰς τὸ δύο λέγειν υἱούς· ἀνάγκη γὰρ πᾶσα διορίσαι, καὶ εἰπεῖν τὸν μὲν, ἄνθρωπον ἰδικῶς, τῇ τοῦ Υἱοῦ κλήσει τετιμημένον· ἰδικῶς δὲ πάλιν, τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον, υἱότητος ὄνομά τε καὶ χρῆμα ἔχοντα φυσικῶς.

Οὐ διαιρετέον τοιγαροῦν εἰς υἱοὺς δύο τὸν ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. ὀνήσει δὲ κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον τὸν ὀρθὸν τῆς πίστεως λόγον εἰς τὸ οὕτως ἔχειν, κἂν εἰ προσώπων ἕνωσιν ἐπιφημίζωσί τινες· οὐ γὰρ εἴρηκεν ἡ γραφὴ, ὅτι ὁ Λόγος ἀνθρώπου πρόσωπον ἥνωσεν ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλ' John i. 14. ὅτι γέγονε σάρξ. τὸ δὲ σάρκα γενέσθαι τὸν Λόγον, οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ ὅτι παραπλησίως ἡμῖν Heb. ii. 14. μετέσχεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκὸς, ἴδιόν τε σῶμα τὸ ἡμῶν ἐποιήσατο, καὶ προῆλθεν ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γυναικός· οὐκ ἀποβεβληκὼς τὸ εἶναι Θεὸς καὶ τὸ ἐκ Θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι Πατρὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν προσλήψει σαρκὸς μεμενηκὼς ὅπερ ἦν. τοῦτο πρεσβεύει πανταχοῦ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς πίστεως ὁ λόγος· οὕτως εὑρήσομεν τοὺς ἁγίους πεφρονηκότας πατέρας· οὕτω τεθαῤῥήκασι θεοτόκον εἰπεῖν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον· οὐχ ὡς τῆς τοῦ Λόγου φύσεως ἤτοι τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ εἶναι λαβούσης ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου· ἀλλ' ὡς γεννηθέντος ἐξ αὐτῆς τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος, ψυχωθέντος λογικῶς, ᾧ καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνωθεὶς ὁ Λόγος, γεννηθῆναι λέγεται κατὰ σάρκα.

Ταῦτα καὶ νῦν ἐξ ἀγάπης τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ γράφων παρακαλῶ ὡς ἀδελφὸν καὶ διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον 1 Tim. v. 21. τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων, ταῦτα μεθ' ἡμῶν καὶ φρονεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν· ἵνα σώζηται τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἡ εἰρήνη, καὶ τῆς ὁμονοίας καὶ ἀγάπης ὁ σύνδεσμος ἀῤῥαγὴς διαμένῃ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῦ Θεοῦ.

NOTES ON CYRIL'S SECOND LETTER TO NESTORIUS

9 Τέρπειν οἰόμενοι τὴν σὴν ἀκοήν.

Alluding to the long-established jealousy between the sees of Constantinople and Alexandria, which had no doubt led these excommunicated persons to seek refuge at Constantinople.

45 ἡ τοῦ Λόγου φύσις μεταποιηθεῖσα, κ.τ.λ.

This was the tenet of Apollinarius, or at least of his extreme followers. Curiously enough, Apollinarianism, though due to a recoil from Arianism, was yet in its first position—the denial of the Human Mind in Christ—in agreement with it (Athan. c. Apoll. ii. 3). The heresy passed through three stages of development. First, the human νοῦς, as being the seat of sinful thoughts and inclinations, was considered to imply the Arian τρεπτόν, and was surrendered for its place to be supplied by the Divine Logos. Next, the Human Body which Christ took from the Virgin was deemed to be, by His assumption of it, made co-essential with the Deity. Lastly, it was held that Christ's Body was not of Human but of Heavenly origin—ἐξ οὐρανοῦ—a portion of the Deity materialized, as it were; "the Godhead converted into flesh." See again Epist. 3, and Leo's Tome, § 2, where Eutyches is charged with a revival of this notion. Athanasius had

argued against the Arians (Orat. iii. 30) that the σάρξ of John i. 14 was equivalent to ἄνθρωπος, and the two coarser forms of Apollinarianism were combated very fully in his Epistle to Epictetus of Corinth in 372, the acceptance of which became a test of orthodoxy in the Nestorian controversy (see Epist. ad Ioan. *ad fin.*). Apollinarius distinguished between the anima rationalis and the anima animans. The latter he allowed that Christ possessed (Theodor. Dial. 2), but a few of his followers seem to have even denied this. See Leo. Serm. 24 in Nat. Dom. 4, "Apollinaris . . . Filium Dei ita veram humanae carnis credidit suscepisse naturam, ut in illa carne diceret animam non fuisse, quia vicem ejus expleverit ipsa Divinitas." Serm. 28 in Nat. Dom. 8, "Quidam autem aestimaverunt in carne Christi humanam animam non fuisse, sed partes animae ipsam Verbi implesse Deitatem. Quorum imprudentia in hoc transit, ut animam quidem fuisse in Domino faterentur, sed eamdem dicerent mente carnisse, quia sufficeret et homini sola Deitas ad omnia rationis officia. Postremo iidem asserere praesumpserunt partem quamdam Verbi in carnem fuisse conversam; ut in unius dogmatis varietate multiplici, non carnis tantum animaeque natura, sed etiam ipsius Verbi solveretur essentia." Comp. Leo. Epist. 59. 5, "Nec dicimus Christum ita hominem ut aliquid ei desit quod ad humanam certum est pertinere naturam, sive animam, sive mentem rationalem, sive carnem: quae tria falsa et vana Apollinaristarum haereticorum tres partes varias protulerunt."

The Apollinarians were sound on the doctrine of the Trinity; τὴν Τριάδα ὁμοούσιον εἶναι φασίν (Socr. ii. 46). The heresy was first condemned at the Council of Alexandria of 362 (Socr. iii. 7; Athan. Tom. ad Ant.).

46 *οὐδὲ ὅτι εἰς ὅλον ἄνθρωπον μετεβλήθη.*

Comp. Athan. Or. c. Ar. ii. 47, *καὶ γάρ ὥσπερ Ἰωάννου ἀκούσαντες ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, οὐκ αὐτὸν ὅλον σάρκα νοοῦμεν τὸν Λόγον, ἀλλὰ σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενον καὶ γενόμενον.* Greg. Naz. Epist. 101, 102 ad Cled. contr. Apoll. Comp. too the eleventh anathema of the first Sirmian Creed, Socr. ii. 30, *Εἴ τις τὸ Ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο ἀκούων, τὸν Λόγον εἰς σάρκα μεταβεβλῆσθαι νομίζοι, ἢ τροπὴ ὑπομεμενηκότα ἀνειληφέναι τὴν σάρκα, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω*: and see the comments of Hilar. Poit. upon it, de syn. 48.

48 *ἑνώσας ὁ Λ. ἑαυτῷ καθ' ὑπόστασιν,*

"united to Himself Personally." Nestorius would not admit of a Personal Union of the Two Natures in Christ. He allowed only a conjunction or intimate association (*συνάφεια*) between the Logos and the man born of the Virgin, an "accidental" (not "essential") union (*ἕνωσις σχετική*); and thus he ascribed to Christ a distinct human personality, which was dwelt in by the Son of God as a temple, used as an instrument, worn as a vesture, and even admitted to a share in His titles (Serm. 1, 2, 4). Two dicta of his give the keynote of his position: *Διὰ τὸν φοροῦντα τὸν φορούμενον σέβω* (Cyril. adv. Nest. i. 11, Epist. ad Nest. 3) and *Ἐγὼ τὸν γενόμενον διμηνιαῖον καὶ τριμηνιαῖον οὐκ ἂν Θεὸν ὀνομάσαιμι* (Socr. vii. 34). He thus, as the Chalcedonian fathers termed it, "rent the mystery of the Incarnation into a Duad of Sons"—One Begotten of God and one born of the Virgin. This separation into two persons had already been condemned by Athanasius, Or. c. Arian. iv. 31–33; comp. Petav. de Inc. i. 9, iii. 3.

50 *κατὰ θέλησιν μόνην ἢ εὐδοκίαν.*

This was the position of Theodore, whom Nestorius followed. He held that the indwelling of the Logos in Christ was a *moral* one, *κατ' εὐδοκίαν*, comp. Luke iii. 22, an indwelling differing only in degree, but not in kind, from the indwelling of God in His saints, and capable of being illustrated by the marriage union of man and wife into "one flesh." Jesus thus became the chief of all the "adopted" sons of God. This Nestorian view had been anticipatorily dealt with by Athanasius, Or. c. Arian iii. 30, *Ἄνθρωπος δὲ γέγονε, καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἄνθρωπον ἦλθεν, κ.τ.λ.*

53 *οὐχ ὡς τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν.*

This truth was constantly emphasized in the Christological controversies, and these very words of Cyril were adopted in the letter of the Ephesine Council to the deposed Nestorius (apud Leo. Epist. 26, Flav. ad. Leon), and were also incorporated in the Chalcedonian Definitio Fidei, § 4. Comp. Vincent. Ler. Common. 13, "Est in Christo Verbum, anima, caro; sed hoc totum unus est Christus . . . Unus autem non corruptibili nescio qua Divinitatis et Humanitatis confusione, sed integra et singulari quadam unitate Personae. Neque enim illa conjunctio alterum in alterum convertit atque mutavit, sed ita in unum potius utrumque compegit, ut manente semper in Christo singularitate unius ejusdemque Personae, in aeternum quoque permaneat proprietas uniuscujusque Naturae." Leo. Serm. 21; Tome, § 3. Tertullian's writings were the ultimate source whence this language was taken; see adv. Prax. 27, "Et adeo salva est utriusque proprietas substantiae," *etc.* See below on *ἀσυγχύτως* in Chalc. Def.

56 *ἀφράστου καὶ ἀποῤῥήτου.*

Cyril echoes Athanasius in insisting on the mysteriousness of the Incarnation; see *e.g.* Or. c. Ar. i. 41. Comp. Augustin. Serm. 215, "Deo gratias, quia id quod competenter non potest dici, potest fideliter credi!" *ib.* 244, "Expone quomodo natus si semper fuit. Non expono; non possum."

59 *οὐχ ὡς τῆς θείας αὐτοῦ φύσεως ἀρχήν, κ.τ.λ.*

This was what Nestorius imagined was implied in *θεοτόκος*. It was an actual tenet of Paul of Samosata; Athan. c. Apoll. i. 20, *πῶς λέγετε Θεὸν ὡς Παῦλος ὁ Σαμοσατεύς; τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς ἐκείνου ἀσεβείας τὸ πρόσχημα, Θεὸν ὁμολογεῖν τὸν ἐκ Μαρίας, πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν προορισθέντα, ἐκ δὲ Μαρίας τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἐσχηκότα.*

67 *προῆλθεν ἐκ γυναικός.* See note below.

72 *οὕτω φαμὲν αὐτὸν καὶ παθεῖν.*

Since the Person, the Self, the "Ego" of the Incarnate Son was Divine it became possible and right to speak of the acts of either Nature as those of God. Accordingly St. Paul spoke of the crucifixion of the Lord of Glory (1 Cor. xi. 8) and of the Second Man being "from heaven" (1 Cor. xv. 47), and St. John of the Son of Man being "in heaven" (John iii. 13).* The technical term for this method of speaking is Antidosis (*ἀντίδοσις*) or Communicatio Idiomatum, whereby all that can be predicated of the Divine or Human Nature may with equal propriety be predicated of the One Divine Person of Christ. It is the Person who acts or suffers; it is His Nature, Divine or Human, which makes Him capable of

* The reading of Acts xx. 28 is too uncertain to form the basis of an argument.

either (Hooker, v. 52). Leo drew this out at length in the Tome, § 5. Nestorius would not or could not see the validity of this method of speech, nor allow that the Son could enter the sphere of human life while still remaining within the Divine sphere. He held, and rightly, that God could not be born secundum Deitatem, but he thence argued wrongly that He could not be born secundum Humanitatem, and that *θεοτόκος* was an inappropriate title for the Virgin. In other words, he failed to distinguish between the Personal God Incarnate and His impassible Godhead.

90 *οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνοῦντες τῷ Λόγῳ.* See below on Anath. 8.

109 *προῆλθεν ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γυναικός.* So again in Epist. 3, but the phrase is Athanasian: ad. Epict. 12, *ἐκ δὲ Μαρίας αὐτὸς ὁ Λόγος σάρκα λαβὼν προῆλθεν ἄνθρωπος.* Comp. contr. Apollin. i. 9, *Θεὸς Λόγος ἐκ παρθένου τῆς ἁγίας Μαρίας προελθὼν ἄνθρωπος.*

114 *θεοτόκον.* "She who bare [as to His Human Nature] Him who is [personally] God."

This epithet was of very ancient use in the language of the Church; Theodoret (Haer. iv. 12) refers it to "the Apostolical Tradition," and indeed its equivalent is found in Scripture: Luke i. 43, *ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μοῦ.* Comp. Ignat. Ephes. 18, *ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν.* The usual Latin equivalent was "Deipara," but Tertullian practically used the phrase "Mater Dei" (de pat. 3, "Nasci se Deus in utero patitur matris"), and Leo (Serm. 21, Epist. 165)

used "Dei genetrix." Origen (according to Socrates, vii. 32), in his commentary on Rom. i. 5, gave an ample exposition of the use of the word: *ἑρμηνεύων πῶς "Θεοτόκος" λέγεται πλάτεως ἐξήτασε.* Eusebius himself used it (Vit. Const. iii. 43), and placed in the mouth of Constantine in his Oration (ad Sanct. Coet. 11) the expression *Θεοῦ μήτηρ κόρη.* Alexander (Theod. H.E. i. 4) spoke of Christ taking a body, *ἐκ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας*, and so Athanasius Or. c. Ar. iii. 14, 29, 33; iv. 32; Cyril. Jer. Cat. x. 19; Ambros. Hexaem. v. 20 (Mater Dei).

The doctrine emphasized by the term Theotokos is that of the One Divine Personality of Christ. He was God before He became Man, and His Personality remained unchanged by His Human conception and birth from the Virgin—only to His Divine Nature was thereby added Human Nature.

Nestorius would not admit the legitimacy of the title. He shrank from the condescension of God implied in it. He refused to allow that from the initial moment of His conception by the Virgin the Personality of Him whom she bore was Divine. He could not "call a child of two or three months old, God" (Socrat. vii. 34). He thought that, as a middle term between *Θεοτόκος* and *Ἀνθρωποτόκος* (Evagr. i. 7), she might be called *Χριστοτόκος.* In an unreal sense he would probably have allowed *Θεοτόκος*, meaning thereby that Mary was the mother of one who was afterwards by advancement so closely associated with the Son of God and "possessed" by Him as to share His title of "God" (Epist. ad Caelest.). The Child of Mary was thus not *Θεός*, but *Θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος.* With a singular want of logical perception Nestorius was willing to call the Virgin *Θεοδόχος*

(Serm. 7); but this, as Cyril showed, involved the Θεοτόκος. Nestorius missed the point of St. Paul's great Christological passage (Phil. ii. 6–8), which turns upon the identity of Him who existed *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ* with Him who took *μορφὴν δούλου*.

THE THIRD EPISTLE (SYNODICAL) OF CYRIL TO NESTORIUS

INTRODUCTION

NESTORIUS' reply to Cyril's Second letter (Mansi, iv. 891) betrayed an inability to distinguish between "God" and "Godhead." In April 430, Cyril answered Pope Caelestine's letter of the previous year (Easter, 429), and a council at Rome in August condemned Nestorius, giving him ten days to recant. The matter was placed in the hands of Cyril, who held a council at Alexandria in November, which drew up this Third letter, to which twelve anathematisms were appended (Epist. ad Nest. 3, "Cum Salvator"). It was sent at once to Constantinople, along with Caelestine's letter, by the hands of four bishops.

Meanwhile Theodosius, on November 17, had issued the summons for a General Council to meet next Pentecost.

ANALYSIS OF CYRIL'S THIRD LETTER

WITH TWELVE ANATHEMAS

A. *Introduction.* Our reasons for writing:—Duty to Christ, to the Faith, and to the scandalized Church.

B. *Hortatory.* Uniting our counsel with that of the Roman Synod, we exhort you to refrain from perversion of the Truth under pain of excommunication.

Your excommunication of others is disannulled. You must accept the right sense of the Nicene formulary as well as its Terms, and abjure your profane doctrines in the anathematisms appended hereunto.

C. *Doctrinal.* The Nicene Creed.

The doctrine of the Incarnation: the Word was made Flesh, yet remained God. There was no change of Flesh into the Nature of God, nor of the Nature of God into Flesh. While a Child in the Virgin's lap He yet filled Creation as God.

The Hypostatic Union: we worship One Christ, God and Man Personally united,

not merely connected by dignity or authority,

not admitting of a double application of the title Christ,

not a God-carrying man,

but a true Union of Natures, like that of soul and body.

Thus there is One Christ, Son, and Lord,

not a conjunction of man and Word in a union of honour,

or of juxtaposition,

or of "accidental" participation.

Indeed, "conjunction" is an inadequate term;

"union" is the right expression.

He did indeed speak of His Father as His God,

but this was in virtue of the "emptying."

We refuse to say, "I worship him who is worn on account of Him that wore him,"

or, "The assumed is called God along with the Assumer."

Christ is One, not two, who suffered, died, and rose again.

We partake of the Holy Eucharist because it is the Flesh of One who is God, and therefore Life-giving.

The words of Christ in the Gospels are referable to One Person in Two Natures; some pertain to His Godhead, and some to His Manhood.

He is High Priest, not for Himself, but for us only. His Holy Spirit manifests His Glory to man.

By virtue of the Hypostatic Union the Virgin Mary is Theotokos—not that the Word had His beginning from her, nor that He needed a birth in time, but He blessed our birth, and removed the curse, and sanctified marriage.

D. *Conclusion.* This is the true ancient Faith, to which you must unequivocally assent.

E. *Appendix.* It is necessary for you to subscribe the following anathematisms:—

Anathema to him who

(1) denies that the Virgin is Theotokos,

(2) denies that the Word is Personally united to Flesh, ONE CHRIST,

(3) severs Christ into two persons joined in dignity,

(4) refers Scriptural sayings respecting Christ to two different persons, one human and one Divine,

(5) asserts that Christ is a God-carrying man,

(6) denies that the Word is alike God and Man,

(7) asserts that the man Jesus was energized by God the Word,

(8) asserts that co-worship is due to a man assumed by God the Word,

(9) denies that the Spirit was Christ's Own,

(10) denies that our High Priest was the very Word of God, who offered for us only,

(11) denies that Christ's Flesh is that of the Life-giving Word,

(12) denies that the Word Himself suffered and died in the Flesh.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΤΡΙΤΗ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΛΛΟΥ ΠΡΟΣ ΝΕΣΤΟΡΙΟΝ

Τῳ εὐλαβεστάτῳ καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ συλλειτουργῷ Νεστορίῳ Κύριλλος καὶ ἡ συνελθοῦσα σύνοδος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐκ τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς διοικήσεως ἐν κυρίῳ χαίρειν.

ΤΟΥ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν λέγοντος ἐναργῶς Ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος, καὶ (Matt. x. 37.) ὁ φιλῶν υἱὸν ἢ θυγατέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος, τί πάθωμεν ἡμεῖς, οἱ παρὰ τῆς σῆς εὐλαβείας ἀπαιτούμενοι τὸ ὑπεραγαπᾶσθαι τοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν Σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ; τίς ἡμᾶς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ὀνῆσαι δυνήσεται; ἢ ποίαν εὑρήσομεν τὴν ἀπολογίαν, σιωπὴν οὕτω τιμήσαντες τὴν μακρὰν ἐπὶ ταῖς παρὰ σοῦ γενομέναις κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ δυσφημίαις; καὶ εἰ μὲν σαυτὸν ἠδίκεις μόνον, τὰ τοιαῦτα φρονῶν καὶ διδάσκων, ἧττων ἂν ἦν ἡ φροντίς· ἐπειδὴ δὲ πᾶσαν ἐσκανδάλισας ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ζύμην αἱρέσεως ἀήθους τε καὶ ξένης ἐμβέβληκας τοῖς λαοῖς· καὶ οὐχὶ τοῖς ἐκεῖσε μόνοις, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἁπανταχοῦ, περιηνέχθη γὰρ τῶν σῶν ἐξηγήσεων τὰ βιβλία· ποῖος ἔτι ταῖς παρ᾽ ἡμῶν σιωπαῖς ἀρκέσει λόγος; ἢ πῶς οὐκ ἀνάγκη μνησθῆναι λέγοντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ (Matt. x. 34, 35.) τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν· ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς. πίσ-

τεως γὰρ ἀδικουμένης, ἐῤῥέτω μὲν ὡς ἕωλος καὶ ἐπισφαλὴς ἡ πρὸς γονέας αἰδώς· ἠρεμείτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τῆς εἰς τέκνα καὶ ἀδελφοὺς φιλοστοργίας νόμος, καὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἀμείνων ἔστω (Heb. xi. 35.) λοιπὸν τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν ὁ θάνατος, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσι, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον.

Ἰδοὺ τοίνυν ὁμοῦ τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, τῇ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην Ῥώμην συνειλεγμένῃ, προεδρεύοντος τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου καὶ θεοσεβεστάτου ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν Κελεστίνου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τρίτῳ σοι τούτῳ διαμαρτυρόμεθα γράμματι, συμβουλεύοντες ἀποσχέσθαι τῶν οὕτω σκαιῶν καὶ ἐξεστραμμένων δογμάτων, ἃ καὶ φρονεῖς καὶ διδάσκεις, ἀνθελέσθαι δὲ τὴν ὀρθὴν πίστιν, τὴν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις παραδοθεῖσαν ἐξ ἀρχῆς διὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ (Luke i. 2.) εὐαγγελιστῶν, οἳ καὶ αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου γεγόνασιν· ἢ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο δράσειεν ἡ σὴ εὐλάβεια, κατὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν προθεσμίαν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι τοῦ μνημονευθέντος ὁσιωτάτου καὶ θεοσεβεστάτου ἐπισκόπου καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν τῆς Ῥωμαίων Κελεστίνου, γίνωσκε σαυτὸν οὐδένα κλῆρον ἔχοντα μεθ' ἡμῶν, οὐδὲ τόπον ἢ λόγον ἐν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐπισκόποις. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδέχεται περιιδεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐκκλησίας οὕτω τεθορυβημένας καὶ σκανδαλισθέντας λαοὺς καὶ πίστιν ὀρθὴν ἀθετουμένην καὶ διασπώμενα παρὰ σοῦ τὰ ποίμνια, τοῦ σώζειν ὀφείλοντος, εἴπερ ἦσθα καθ' ἡμᾶς ὀρθῆς δόξης ἐραστής, τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἰχνηλατῶν εὐσέβειαν. ἅπασι δὲ τοῖς παρὰ τῆς σῆς εὐλαβείας κεχωρισμένοις διὰ τὴν πίστιν, ἢ καθαιρεθεῖσι λαϊκοῖς τε καὶ κληρικοῖς, κοινωνικοὶ πάντες ἐσμέν. οὐ γάρ ἐστι δίκαιον τοὺς ὀρθὰ φρονεῖν ἐγνωκότας σαῖς ἀδικεῖσθαι ψήφοις, ὅτι σοὶ καλῶς ποιοῦντες ἀντειρήκασι. τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτὸ καταμεμήνυκας ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τῇ γραφείσῃ παρὰ σοῦ πρὸς τὸν τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης ἁγιώτατον συνεπίσκοπον ἡμῶν Κελεστῖνον. οὐκ ἀρκέσει δὲ τῇ σῇ εὐλαβείᾳ τὸ συνομολογῆσαι μόνον τὸ τῆς πίστεως σύμ-

βολον, τὸ ἐκτεθὲν κατὰ καιροὺς ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι παρὰ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μεγάλης συνόδου, τῆς κατὰ καιροὺς συναχθείσης ἐν τῇ Νικαέων· νενόηκας γὰρ καὶ ἡρμήνευσας οὐκ ὀρθῶς αὐτὸ, διεστραμμένως δὲ μᾶλλον κἂν ὁμολογῇς τῇ φωνῇ τὴν λέξιν· ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀκόλουθον ἐγγράφως καὶ ἐνωμότως ὁμολογῆσαι, ὅτι καὶ ἀναθεματίζεις μὲν τὰ σαυτοῦ μιαρὰ καὶ βέβηλα δόγματα, φρονήσεις δὲ καὶ διδάξεις, ἃ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἅπαντες, οἵ τε κατὰ τὴν ἑσπέραν καὶ τὴν ἑώαν ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διδάσκαλοι καὶ λαῶν ἡγούμενοι. συνέθετο δὲ καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὴν Ῥώμην ἁγία σύνοδος, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἅπαντες, ὡς ὀρθῶς ἐχούσαις καὶ ἀνεπιλήπτως, ταῖς γραφείσαις ἐπιστολαῖς πρὸς τὴν σὴν εὐλάβειαν παρὰ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας. ὑπετάξαμεν δὲ τούτοις ἡμῶν τοῖς γράμμασιν, ἅ τε δεῖ φρονεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν, καὶ ὧν ἀπέχεσθαι προσήκει.

Αὕτη γὰρ τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πίστις, ᾗ συναινοῦσιν ἅπαντες, οἵ τε κατὰ τὴν ἑσπέραν καὶ τὴν ἑώαν ὀρθόδοξοι ἐπίσκοποι·

ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΜΕΝ εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός· Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, Φῶς ἐκ Φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· ἀνελθόντα εἰς οὐρανοὺς, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας Ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν καί Πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

Ἑπόμενοι δὲ πανταχῇ ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὁμολογίαις, αἷς πεποίηνται, λαλοῦντος ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐννοιῶν ἰχνηλατοῦντες τὸν σκοπὸν, καὶ βασιλικὴν ὥσπερ ἐρχόμενοι τρίβον, φαμὲν ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ Μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, ὁ ἐξ αὐτῆς γεννηθεὶς τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς, τὸ Φῶς τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Φωτὸς, ὁ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, τῆς ἡμετέρας ἕνεκα σωτηρίας κατελθὼν, καὶ καθεὶς ἑαυτὸν εἰς κένωσιν, ἐσαρκώθη τε καὶ ἐνηνθρώπησε, τουτέστι, σάρκα λαβὼν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου, καὶ ἰδίαν αὐτὴν ποιησάμενος ἐκ μήτρας, τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινε γέννησιν, καὶ προῆλθεν ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γυναικὸς, οὐχ ὅπερ ἦν ἀποβεβληκὼς, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ γέγονεν ἐν προσλήψει σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος καὶ οὕτω μεμενηκὼς ὅπερ ἦν, Θεὸς δηλονότι φύσει τε καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· οὔτε δὲ τὴν σάρκα φαμὲν εἰς θεότητος τραπῆναι φύσιν, οὔτε μὴν εἰς φύσιν σαρκὸς τὴν ἀπόρρητον τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου παρενεχθῆναι φύσιν, ἄτρεπτος γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος παντελῶς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀεὶ μένων κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· ὁρώμενος δὲ καὶ βρέφος καὶ ἐσπαργανωμένος, ὢν ἔτι καὶ ἐν κόλπῳ τῆς τεκούσης παρθένου, πᾶσαν ἐπλήρου τὴν κτίσιν ὡς Θεὸς, καὶ σύνεδρος ἦν τῷ γεγεννηκότι. τὸ γὰρ θεῖον ἄποσόν τε ἐστὶ καὶ ἀμέγεθες καὶ περιορισμὸν οὐκ ἀνέχεται.

Cp. John viii. 35.
ib. x. 30.
Mal. iii. 6.

Ἡνῶσθαί γε μὴν σαρκὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ὁμολογοῦντες τὸν Λόγον, ἕνα προσκυνοῦμεν Υἱὸν καὶ Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, οὔτε ἀνὰ μέρος τιθέντες καὶ διορίζοντες ἄνθρωπον καὶ Θεὸν, ὡς συνημμένους ἀλλήλοις τῇ τῆς ἀξίας καὶ αὐθεντίας ἑνότητι· κενοφωνία γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ἕτερον οὐδέν· οὔτε μὴν Χριστὸν ἰδικῶς ὀνομάζοντες τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον, καὶ ὁμοίως ἰδικῶς ὡς χριστὸν ἕτερον τὸν ἐκ γυναικός· ἀλλ' ἕνα μόνον εἰδότες Χριστὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς Λόγον μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός. τότε γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνως κέχρισται μεθ' ἡμῶν, καίτοι τοῖς ἀξίοις τοῦ λαβεῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα διδοὺς αὐτὸς, καὶ

οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου, καθά φησιν ὁ μακάριος εὐαγγελ- [John iii. 34.] ιστὴς Ἰωάννης. ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐκεῖνό φαμεν, ὅτι κατῴκησεν ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγος, ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ κοινῷ τῷ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου γεγεννημένῳ, ἵνα μὴ θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος νοοῖτο Χριστός. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ Λόγος, [John i. 14.] εἴρηται δὲ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ κατοικῆσαι πᾶν τὸ [Col. ii. 9.] πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς· ἀλλ' οὖν ἐννοῶμεν, ὅτι γενόμενος σὰρξ, οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις κατοικῆσαι λέγεται, κατὰ τὸν ἴσον καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τρόπον γενέσθαι διοριζόμεθα τὴν κατοίκησιν· ἀλλ' ἑνωθεὶς κατὰ φύσιν καὶ οὐκ εἰς σάρκα τραπεὶς, τοιαύτην ἐποιήσατο τὴν κατοίκησιν, ἣν ἂν ἔχειν λέγοιτο καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴ πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον ἑαυτῆς σῶμα.

Εἷς οὖν ἄρα Χριστὸς καὶ Υἱὸς καὶ Κύριος, οὐχ ὡς συνάφειαν ἁπλῶς τὴν ὡς ἑνότητι τῆς ἀξίας ἤγουν αὐθεντίας ἔχοντος ἀνθρώπου πρὸς Θεόν· οὐ γὰρ ἑνοῖ τὰς φύσεις ἡ ἰσοτιμία, καὶ γοῦν Πέτρος τε καὶ Ἰωάννης, ἰσότιμοι μὲν ἀλλήλοις, καθὸ καὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἅγιοι μαθηταὶ, πλὴν οὐχ εἷς οἱ δύο· οὔτε μὴν κατὰ παράθεσιν τὸν τῆς συναφείας νοοῦμεν τρόπον, οὐκ ἀπόχρη γὰρ τοῦτο πρὸς ἕνωσιν φυσικήν· οὔτε μὴν ὡς κατὰ μέθεξιν σχετικὴν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς κολλώμενοι τῷ Κυρίῳ, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμ- [1 Cor. vi. 17.] ένον, ἓν πνεῦμά ἐσμεν πρὸς αὐτόν· μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ τῆς συναφείας ὄνομα παραιτούμεθα, ὡς οὐκ ἔχον ἱκανῶς σημῆναι τὴν ἕνωσιν. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Θεὸν ἢ Δεσπότην τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγον ὀνομάζομεν· ἵνα μὴ πάλιν ἀναφανδὸν τέμνωμεν εἰς δύο τὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Κύριον, καὶ δυσφημίας ἐγκλήματι περιπέσωμεν, Θεὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Δεσπότην ποιοῦντες αὐτόν. ἑνωθεὶς γὰρ, ὡς ἤδη προείπομεν, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος σαρκὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν, Θεὸς μέν ἐστι τῶν ὅλων, δεσπόζει δὲ τοῦ παντός· οὔτε δὲ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ δοῦλός ἐστιν, οὔτε Δεσπότης· εὔηθες γὰρ, μᾶλλον δὲ ἤδη καὶ δυσσεβὲς, τὸ οὕτω φρονεῖν ἢ λέγειν. ἔφη μὲν γὰρ Θεὸν

John xx. 17. ἑαυτοῦ τὸν Πατέρα καίτοι Θεὸς ὢν φύσει καὶ ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἠγνοήκαμεν, ὅτι μετὰ τοῦ εἶναι Θεὸς, καὶ ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν ὁ ὑπὸ Θεῷ, κατά γε τὸν πρέποντα νόμον τῇ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος φύσει. αὐτὸς δὲ ἑαυτοῦ πῶς ἂν γένοιτο Θεὸς ἢ Δεσπότης; οὐκοῦν, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὅσον ἧκεν εἴς γε τὸ πρέπον τοῖς τῆς κενώσεως μέτροις, ὑπὸ Θεῷ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν εἶναί φησιν. οὕτω Gal. iv. 5. γέγονε καὶ ὑπὸ νόμον, καίτοι λαλήσας αὐτὸς τὸν νόμον καὶ νομοθέτης ὑπάρχων, ὡς Θεός.

Παραιτούμεθα δὲ λέγειν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ Διὰ τὸν φοροῦντα τὸν φορούμενον σέβω, διὰ τὸν ἀόρατον προσκυνῶ τὸν ὁρώμενον, φρικτὸν δὲ πρὸς τούτῳ κἀκεῖνο εἰπεῖν Ὁ ληφθεὶς τῷ λαβόντι συγχρηματίζει Θεός. ὁ γὰρ ταῦτα λέγων διατέμνει πάλιν εἰς δύο χριστοὺς, καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἵστησιν ἀνὰ μέρος ἰδικῶς καὶ Θεὸν ὁμοίως· ἀρνεῖται γὰρ ὁμολογουμένως τὴν ἕνωσιν, καθ' ἣν οὐχ ὡς ἕτερος ἑτέρῳ συμπροσκυνεῖταί τις, οὔτε μὴν συγχρηματίζει Θεός· ἀλλ' εἷς νοεῖται Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, Υἱὸς Μονογενὴς, μιᾷ προσκυνήσει τιμώμενος μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκός. ὁμολογοῦμεν δὲ, ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθεὶς Υἱὸς καὶ Θεὸς Μονογενὴς καίτοι κατὰ 1 Peter iv. 1. φύσιν ἰδίαν ὑπάρχων ἀπαθὴς, σαρκὶ πέπονθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ σταυρωθέντι σώματι τὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς ἀπαθῶς οἰκειούμενος πάθη, Heb. ii. 9. χάριτι δὲ Θεοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ παντὸς ἐγεύσατο θανάτου, διδοὺς αὐτῷ τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, καίτοι κατὰ φύσιν John xi. 25. ὑπάρχων ζωὴ, καὶ αὐτὸς ὢν ἡ ἀνάστασις. ἵνα γὰρ ἀῤῥήτῳ δυνάμει πατήσας τὸν θάνατον, ὡς ἔν γε δὴ Col. i. 18. πρώτῃ τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκὶ, γένηται πρωτότοκος 1 Cor. xv. 20. ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, ὁδοποιήσῃ τε τῇ ἀνθρώπου φύσει τὴν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἀναδρομὴν, χάριτι Θεοῦ, καθάπερ ἔφημεν ἀρτίως, ὑπὲρ Heb. ii. 9. παντὸς ἐγεύσατο θανάτου· τριήμερος δὲ ἀνεβίω σκυλεύσας τὸν ᾅδην. ὥστε κἂν λέγηται δι'

ἀνθρώπου γενέσθαι ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, [1 Cor. xv. 21.] ἀλλὰ νοοῦμεν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ γεγονότα Λόγον· καὶ λελύσθαι δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θανάτου τὸ κράτος· ἥξει δὲ κατὰ καιροὺς ὡς εἷς Υἱὸς καὶ Κύριος ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἵνα κρίνῃ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καθὰ [Acts xvii. 31.] γέγραπται.

Ἀναγκαίως δὲ κἀκεῖνο προσθήσομεν· καταγγέλλοντες γὰρ τὸν κατὰ σάρκα θάνατον τοῦ Μονογενοῦς [1 Cor. xi. 26.] Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τουτέστιν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τήν τε ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναβίωσιν, καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν ὁμολογοῦντες, τὴν ἀναίμακτον ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τελοῦμεν λατρείαν· πρόσιμέν τε οὕτω ταῖς μυστικαῖς εὐλογίαις καὶ ἁγιαζόμεθα, μέτοχοι γινόμενοι τῆς τε ἁγίας σαρκὸς καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος τοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν Σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ. καὶ οὐχ ὡς σάρκα κοινὴν δεχόμενοι, μὴ γένοιτο· οὔτε μὴν ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἡγιασμένου καὶ συναφθέντος τῷ Λόγῳ κατὰ τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς ἀξίας, ἤγουν ὡς θείαν ἐνοίκησιν ἐσχηκότος· ἀλλ' ὡς ζωοποιὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου. ζωὴ γὰρ ὢν κατὰ φύσιν ὡς Θεὸς, ἐπειδὴ γέγονεν ἓν πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα, ζωοποιὸν ἀπέφηνεν αὐτήν. ὥστε κἂν λέγῃ πρὸς ἡμᾶς Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε [John vi. 53.] τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πίητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα· οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπου τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἑνὸς καὶ αὐτὴν εἶναι λογιούμεθα, πῶς γὰρ ἡ ἀνθρώπου σὰρξ ζωοποιὸς ἔσται, κατὰ φύσιν τὴν ἑαυτῆς; ἀλλ' ὡς ἰδίαν ἀληθῶς γενομένην τοῦ δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου γεγονότος τε καὶ χρηματίσαντος.

Τὰς δέ γε ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν φωνὰς, οὔτε ὑποστάσεσι δυσὶν οὔτε μὴν προσώποις καταμερίζομεν· οὐ γάρ ἐστι διπλοῦς ὁ εἷς καὶ μόνος Χριστὸς, κἂν ἐκ δύο νοῆται καὶ διαφόρων πραγμάτων εἰς ἑνότητα τὴν ἀμέριστον συνενηνεγμένος, καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ ψυχῆς νοεῖται καὶ σώματος, καὶ οὐ διπλοῦς μᾶλλον, ἀλλ' εἷς ἐξ

ἀμφοῖν· ἀλλὰ τάς τε ἀνθρωπίνας, καὶ πρός γε τούτῳ τὰς θεϊκὰς, παρ' ἑνὸς εἰρῆσθαι διακεισόμεθα φρονοῦντες ὀρθῶς. ὅταν μὲν γὰρ θεοπρεπῶς λέγῃ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ Ὁ ἑωρακὼς
John xiv. 9. ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν Πατέρα, καί Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ
ib. x. 30. Πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν, τὴν θείαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπόῤῥητον ἐννοοῦμεν φύσιν, καθ' ἣν καὶ ἕν ἐστι πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ
2 Cor. iv. 4, Col. i. 15, Heb. i. 3. Πατέρα διὰ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς οὐσίας, εἰκών τε καὶ χαρακτὴρ καὶ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ· ὅταν δὲ τὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος μέτρον οὐκ ἀτιμάζων,
John viii. 40. τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις προσλαλῇ Νῦν δέ με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι, ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα, πάλιν οὐδὲν ἧττον αὐτὸν τὸν ἐν ἰσότητί τε καὶ ὁμοιότητι τοῦ Πατρὸς Θεὸν Λόγον καὶ ἐκ τῶν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος αὐτοῦ μέτρων ἐπιγινώσκομεν. εἰ γάρ ἐστιν ἀναγκαῖον τὸ πιστεύειν, ὅτι Θεὸς ὢν φύσει γέγονε σὰρξ, ἤγουν ἄνθρωπος ἐμψυχωμένος ψυχῇ λογικῇ· ποῖον ἂν ἔχοι λόγον τὸ ἐπαισχύνεσθαί τινας ταῖς παρ' αὐτοῦ φωναῖς, εἰ γεγόνασιν ἀνθρωποπρεπῶς; εἰ γὰρ παραιτοῖτο τοὺς ἀνθρώπῳ πρέποντας λόγους, τίς ὁ ἀναγκάσας γενέσθαι καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπον; ὁ δὲ καθεὶς ἑαυτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς εἰς ἑκούσιον κένωσιν, διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν παραιτοῖτο ἂν τοὺς τῇ κενώσει πρέποντας λόγους; ἑνὶ τοιγαροῦν προσώπῳ τὰς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις πάσας ἀναθετέον φωνὰς, ὑποστάσει μιᾷ τῇ τοῦ Λόγου
1 Cor. viii. 6. σεσαρκωμένῃ. Κύριος γὰρ εἷς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.

Heb. iii. 1. Εἰ δὲ δὴ καλοῖτο καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, ὡς ἱερουργῶν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ τὴν πρὸς ἡμῶν αὐτῷ τε καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ προσκομιζομένην τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογίαν· καὶ μὴν καὶ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· πάλιν αὐτὸν εἶναί φαμεν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ κατὰ φύσιν Υἱὸν Μονογενῆ, καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπῳ προσνεμοῦμεν παρ' αὐτὸν ἑτέρῳ, τό τε τῆς ἱερωσύνης ὄνομα,
1 Tim. ii. 5. καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ χρῆμα· γέγονε γὰρ μεσίτης

Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαλλακτὴς εἰς εἰρήνην· ἑαυτὸν
ἀναθεὶς εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Eph. v. 2.
Πατρί. τοιγάρτοι καὶ ἔφασκε Θυσίαν καὶ Heb. x. 5–7.
προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, ὁλοκαυτώματα (Ps. xl. 6–8).
καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ηὐδόκησας, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι· τότε εἶπον Ἰδοὺ ἥκω, ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ, τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ θέλημά σου. προσκεκόμικε γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, καὶ οὐχ ὑπέρ γε μᾶλλον ἑαυτοῦ. ποίας γὰρ ἂν ἐδεήθη προσφορᾶς ἢ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, κρείττων ἁπάσης ἁμαρτίας ὑπάρχων ὡς Θεός; εἰ γὰρ πάντες
ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Rom. iii. 23.
Θεοῦ, καθὸ γεγόναμεν ἡμεῖς ἕτοιμοι πρὸς παραφορὰν, καὶ κατηῤῥώστησεν ἡ ἀνθρώπου φύσις τὴν ἁμαρτίαν (αὐτὸς δὲ οὐχ οὕτω), καὶ ἡττώμεθα διὰ τοῦτο τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ· πῶς ἂν εἴη λοιπὸν ἀμφίβολον, ὅτι τέθυται δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἀμνὸς ὁ ἀληθινός; καὶ τὸ λέγειν ὅτι προσκεκόμικεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπέρ τε ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν, ἀμοιρήσειεν ἂν οὐδαμῶς τῶν εἰς δυσσέβειαν ἐγκλημάτων· πεπλημμέληκε γὰρ κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον, οὔτε μὴν ἐποίησεν ἁμαρτίαν. ποίας οὖν ἐδεήθη προσφορᾶς, ἁμαρτίας οὐκ οὔσης, ἐφ' ἧπερ ἂν γένοιτο καὶ μάλα εἰκότως;

Ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος Ἐκεῖνος John xvi. 14.
ἐμὲ δοξάσει· νοοῦντες ὀρθῶς, οὐχ ὡς δόξης ἐπιδεᾶ τῆς παρ' ἑτέρου φαμὲν, τὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καί Υἱὸν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος δόξαν ἑλεῖν· ὅτι μηδὲ κρεῖττον αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ. ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ θεότητος ἐχρῆτο τῷ ἰδίῳ Πνεύματι πρὸς μεγαλουργίαν, δεδοξάσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ φησιν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ καί τις λέγοι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς περὶ τῆς ἐνούσης ἰσχύος αὐτῷ τυχὸν ἤγουν ἐπιστήμης τῆς ἐφ' ὁτῳοῦν, ὅτι δοξάσουσιν ἐμέ. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἔστιν ἐν ὑποστάσει τὸ Πνεῦμα ἰδικῇ, καὶ δὴ καὶ νοεῖται καθ' ἑαυτὸ, καθὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ οὐχ Υἱός· ἀλλ' οὖν ἐστιν οὐκ

John xv. 26. ἀλλότριον αὐτοῦ· πνεῦμα γὰρ ἀληθείας ὠνό-
ib. xiv. 6. μασται, καὶ ἔστι Χριστὸς ἡ ἀλήθεια· καὶ προ-
χεῖται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ
Πατρός. ἐνεργῆσαν τοιγαροῦν τὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ διὰ χειρὸς
τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων τὰ παράδοξα μετὰ τὸ ἀνελθεῖν τὸν
Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν,
ἐδόξασεν αὐτόν. ἐπιστεύθη γὰρ, ὅτι Θεὸς κατὰ φύσιν
ἐστὶ πάλιν αὐτὸς ἐνεργῶν διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου Πνεύματος. διὰ
John xvi. 14. τοῦτο καὶ ἔφασκεν Ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται,
καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. καὶ οὔτι που φαμὲν, ὡς ἐκ μετοχῆς
τὸ Πνεῦμά ἐστι σοφόν τε καὶ δυνατόν· παντέλειον γὰρ καὶ
ἀπροσδεές ἐστι παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς
δυνάμεως καὶ σοφίας, τουτέστι τοῦ Υἱοῦ, Πνεῦμά ἐστιν,
αὐτόχρημα σοφία ἐστὶ καὶ δύναμις.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θεὸν ἑνωθέντα σαρκὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἡ ἁγία
παρθένος ἐκτέτοκε σαρκικῶς, ταύτητοι καὶ θεοτόκον εἶναί
φαμεν αὐτὴν, οὐχ ὡς τῆς τοῦ Λόγου φύσεως τῆς ὑπάρξεως
John i. 1. τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐχούσης ἀπὸ σαρκός· ἦν γὰρ ἐν ἀρχῇ
καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν,
καὶ αὐτός ἐστι τῶν αἰώνων ὁ ποιητὴς, συναΐδιος τῷ Πατρὶ,
καὶ τῶν ὅλων ὁ δημιουργός· ἀλλ' ὡς ἤδη προείπομεν, ἐπειδὴ
καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνώσας ἑαυτῷ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, καὶ ἐκ μήτρας
αὐτῆς γέννησιν ὑπέμεινε σαρκικὴν, οὐχ ὡς δεηθεὶς ἀναγκαίως,
ἤτοι διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν, καὶ τῆς ἐν χρόνῳ καὶ ἐν ἐσχάτοις
τοῦ αἰῶνος καιροῖς γεννήσεως· ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ αὐτὴν τῆς
ὑπάρξεως ἡμῶν εὐλογήσῃ τὴν ἀρχήν· καὶ τεκούσης γυναικὸς
αὐτὸν ἑνωθέντα σαρκὶ, παύσηται λοιπὸν ἡ κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ
γένους ἀρὰ, πέμπουσα πρὸς θάνατον τὰ ἐκ γῆς ἡμῶν σώματα,
Gen. iii. 16. καὶ τό Ἐν λύπαις τέξῃ τέκνα δι' αὐτοῦ
καταργούμενον, ἀληθὲς ἀποφήνῃ τὸ διὰ τῆς τοῦ προφήτου
Isa. xxv. 8. φωνῆς Κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας, καὶ
Apoc. vii. 17. πάλιν ἀφεῖλεν ὁ Θεὸς πᾶν δάκρυον ἀπὸ
παντὸς προσώπου. ταύτης γὰρ ἕνεκα τῆς αἰτίας φαμὲν

αὐτὸν οἰκονομικῶς καὶ αὐτὸν εὐλογῆσαι τὸν γάμον, καὶ ἀπελθεῖν κεκλημένον ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας John ii. 2. ὁμοῦ τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις.

Ταῦτα φρονεῖν δεδιδάγμεθα παρά τε τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ εὐαγγελιστῶν καὶ πάσης δὲ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, καὶ ἐκ τῆς τῶν μακαρίων πατέρων ἀληθοῦς ὁμολογίας. τούτοις ἅπασι καὶ τὴν σὴν εὐλάβειαν συναινέσαι χρὴ, καὶ συνθέσθαι δίχα δόλου παντός. ἃ δέ ἐστιν ἀναγκαῖον ἀναθεματίσαι τὴν σὴν εὐλάβειαν, ὑποτέτακται τῇδε ἡμῶν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ.

α′. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ Θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον· γεγέννηκε γὰρ σαρκικῶς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον· ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

β′. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ σαρκὶ καθ᾽ ὑπόστασιν ἡνῶσθαι τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγον, ἕνα τε εἶναι Χριστὸν μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς, τὸν αὐτὸν δηλόνοτι Θεόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

γ′. Εἴ τις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Χριστοῦ διαιρεῖ τὰς ὑποστάσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μόνῃ συνάπτων αὐτὰς συναφείᾳ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν αὐθεντίαν ἢ δυναστείαν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον συνόδῳ τῇ καθ᾽ ἕνωσιν φυσικὴν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

δ′. Εἴ τις προσώποις δυσὶν ἤγουν ὑποστάσεσι τάς τε ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς καὶ ἀποστολικοῖς συγγράμμασι διανέμει φωνὰς, ἢ ἐπὶ Χριστῷ παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων λεγομένας, ἢ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ τὰς μὲν ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ παρὰ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον ἰδικῶς νοουμένῳ προσάπτει, τὰς δὲ ὡς θεοπρεπεῖς μόνῳ τῷ ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγῳ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ε′. Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν θεοφόρον ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον Θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, ὡς Υἱὸν ἕνα καὶ φύσει, καθὸ γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ Λόγος καὶ John i. 14. κεκοινώνηκε παραπλησίως ἡμῖν αἵματος Heb. ii. 14. καὶ σαρκὸς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ϛʹ. Εἴ τις λέγει Θεὸν ἢ Δεσπότην εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγον, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖ Θεόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ὡς γεγονότος σαρκὸς τοῦ Λόγου κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ζʹ. Εἴ τις φησὶν, ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἐνηργῆσθαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Μονογενοῦς εὐδοξίαν περιῆφθαι, ὡς ἑτέρῳ παρ' αὐτὸν ὑπάρχοντι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ηʹ. Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι δεῖν τῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ καὶ συνδοξάζεσθαι καὶ συγχρηματίζειν Θεὸν, ὡς ἕτερον ἐν ἑτέρῳ· τὸ γάρ Σὺν ἀεὶ προστιθέμενον τοῦτο νοεῖν ἀναγκάσει· καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον μιᾷ προσκυνήσει τιμᾷ τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ μίαν αὐτῷ τὴν δοξολογίαν ἀναπέμπει, καθὸ γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ Λόγος, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

θʹ. Εἴ τις φησὶ τὸν ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δεδοξάσθαι παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ὡς ἀλλοτρίᾳ δυνάμει τῇ δι' αὐτοῦ χρώμενον, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντα τὸ ἐνεργεῖν δύνασθαι κατὰ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, καὶ τὸ πληροῦν εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὰς θεοσημίας, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα, φησὶ, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐνήργηκε τὰς θεοσημίας, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Heb. iii. 1. ιʹ. Ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἀπόστολον τῆς ὁμολο-
γίας ἡμῶν γεγενῆσθαι Χριστὸν ἡ θεία λέγει γραφὴ, προς-
Eph. v. 2. κεκόμικε δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας
τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρί. εἴ τις τοίνυν ἀρχιερέα φησὶ καὶ ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν γενέσθαι, οὐκ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον, ὅτε γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος· ἀλλ' ὡς ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὸν ἰδικῶς ἄνθρωπον ἐκ γυναικός· ἢ εἴ τις λέγει καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ προσενεγκεῖν αὐτὸν τὴν προσφορὰν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ μόνων ἡμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐδεήθη
2 Cor. v. 21. προσφορᾶς ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ἁμαρτίαν· ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ιά. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου σάρκα ζωοποιὸν εἶναι καὶ ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγου· ἀλλ' ὡς ἑτέρου τινὸς παρ' αὐτὸν, συνημμένου μὲν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν ὡς μόνην θείαν ἐνοίκησιν ἐσχηκότος, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ζωοποιὸν, ὡς ἔφημεν, ὅτι γέγονεν ἰδία τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ τὰ πάντα ζωογονεῖν ἰσχύοντος, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

ιβ'. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον παθόντα σαρκὶ καὶ ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ καὶ θανάτου Heb. ii. 9.
γευσάμενον σαρκὶ, γεγονότα τε πρωτότοκον Col. i. 18.
ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καθὸ ζωή ἐστι καὶ ζωοποιὸς ὡς Θεὸς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

NOTES ON CYRIL'S THIRD LETTER TO NESTORIUS

31 *ὁμοῦ τῇ ἁγία συνόδῳ.* The synod at Rome under Caelestine, held at the beginning of August, 430. Cyril had sent to Rome in April an account of all that had passed, together with copies of his Letter to the Monks and of his two Letters to Nestorius. Caelestine in the synod had quoted the authority of Ambrose ("Veni Redemptor Gentium"), Hilary, and Damasus, with all of whom Cyril was in agreement, and the synod condemned the teaching of Nestorius, committing the execution of the sentence to Cyril. The pope wrote seven letters, all dated August 11th, to the bishops of the principal sees in the East and to the clergy of Constantinople. These were sent to Cyril to be forwarded by him.

41 *κατὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν προθεσμίαν.* Ten days after the receipt of Caelestine's letter was the period assigned in which Nestorius might recant his error.

55 *ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τῇ γραφείσῃ παρὰ σοῦ.* This was the letter written about Easter, 429, by Nestorius to Caelestine, in which he advocated the use of "Christotokos" instead of "Theotokos." It was carried to Rome by Antiochus (cf. Mansi, iv. 1197).

69 *ταῖς γραφείσαις ἐπιστολαῖς . . . ἐκκλησίας.* The First and Second Letters of Cyril to Nestorius.

100 *καθεὶς ἑαυτὸν εἰς κένωσιν.* Here, and below, the *κένωσις* is defined to consist in the condescension involved in the Incarnation. See note on *κατελθόντα* in Nicene Creed, and compare Leo's words in the Tome, § 3.

108 *ἄτρεπτος γάρ ἐστι, κ.τ.λ.* The same thought is repeated again, Epist. ad Ioan.

110 *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.* Cyril evidently had in mind the Scriptural citations in Alexander's encyclical of 324 (apud Socr. i. 6), Πῶς δὲ τρεπτὸς ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸς ὁ λέγων δι' ἑαυτοῦ Ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί· καὶ Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν· διὰ δὲ τοῦ προφήτου Ἴδετέ με ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ καὶ οὐκ ἠλλοίωμαι; John x. 30; Mal. iii. 6; comp. John viii. 35.

111 *ὢν ἔτι καὶ ἐν κόλπῳ, κ.τ.λ.* Here again is the Communicatio Idiomatum used in a startling paradox. Less startling, because more familiar, examples of it exist in the Christmas Sequence "Adeste Fideles," and the Christmas hymns of Charles Wesley and J. Byrom. Comp. the sermon preached at Constantinople in 429 by Proclus of Cyzicus (Orat. i. 9), Ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ παρθένου· ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἀγκάλαις μητρὸς καὶ ἐπὶ πτερύγων ἀνέμων· κ.τ.λ. (Bright. Hist. Church, p. 313).

124 *τὸ Πνεῦμα διδοὺς αὐτός.* Cyril's text agrees with that of the oldest uncials, ℵ B (John iii. 34). The argument is that Christ cannot be merely an anointed man, because He Himself bestows the Spirit out of His own fulness of possession.

128 *θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος.* See Anath. 5.

136 ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴ πρὸς τὸ ἴδιον ἑαυτῆς σῶμα. This analogy is not a perfect one, but it is a sufficient illustration of a natural union in which two unconfused "substances" constitute one person. Cyril employs it, Epist. ad Succens., Epist. ad Valer., Schol. 8, 27, and it is also used by Theodoret, Dial. ii. *Inconfusus*, Epist. 143; by the author of the Quicumque; by Gregor., Naz. Epist. 101 (ad Cled. i. 4); and by Augustine, Epist. ad Volus. It is discussed by Petavius de Inc. iii. 9 (Ottley, Incarn. ii. 279).

143 κατὰ παράθεσιν, "by juxtaposition," a co-existence of two things or persons one by the side of another.

145 κατὰ μέθεξιν σχετικήν, "by an acquired participation." Cyril's language is tinctured with terms of the Stoic philosophy, in which σχετικός = "non-essential," "accidental," not springing from the nature of the object. Such qualities were termed σχέσεις. The Stoics, according to Chrysippus (apud Stobaeus Ecl. i. 17, p. 144, Gaisford; p. 376, Heeren), distinguished between παράθεσις, μίξις, κρᾶσις, and σύγχυσις. They defined παράθεσις as σωμάτων συναφὴ κατὰ τὰς ἐπιφανείας, ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν σωρῶν ὁρῶμεν, καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν αἰγιαλῶν ψήφων καὶ ἄμμων. Μίξις is explained as a complete interpenetration, as in the case of red-hot iron. Κρᾶσις applies to a mechanical mixture, as of certain liquids, such as wine and water. Σύγχυσις is a chemical combination resulting in a third substance. The philosophical use of these terms is important in view of the employment of κρᾶσις and σύγχυσις in the Eutychian controversy. Compare too Epist. ad Joan.

148 συναφεία is rejected as inadequate; "association,"

"conjunction," "connexion," stops short of "union." See P. E. Pusey's note on adv. Nest. i. 3 in Libr. Fath. p. 19.

167 *παραιτούμεθα, κ.τ.λ.* These were two dicta of Nestorius, Cyr. adv. Nest. ii. 11, 12. Similarly in his Serm. 1 he had said, *τὴν θεοδόχον τῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ συνθεολογῶμεν μορφήν*; and again Serm. 2, *τὴν φορουμενὴν τῷ φοροῦντι συντιμῶμεν φύσιν.* In each case the *σύν*, as Cyril shows in Anath. 8, implies non-identity. For another dictum see above, p. 110.

173 *ὡς ἕτερος ἑτέρῳ.* See note on Anath. 8, p. 153.

180 *οἰκειούμενος.* "Making His own," "appropriating." Cyril uses *οἰκειοῦσθαι* as Athanasius used *ἰδιοποιεῖν*, see Orat. c. Ar. iii. 33, *τοῦ Λόγου ἰδιοποιουμένου τὰ τῆς σαρκός*, *ib.* 38; de Inc. V.D. 6, 8, 31; Epist. ad Epict. 6; contr. Apoll. i. 12, 13. Comp. for *οἰκείωται* *ib.* ii. 16; Cyril, Apol. adv. Orient. 12; Schol. 36. This point is enforced in Anath. 12, and again Epist. ad Joan.

197 *καταγγέλλοντες γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.* Dr. Swainson gathered from these words that "some Creed was used in Cyril's time in the Eucharistic office" (Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, p. 107), but Cyril's meaning surely is that the service itself was a proclamation of the Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ. He evidently had in mind some such words as are found in the Liturgy of St. Mark, *τὸν ἐμὸν θάνατον καταγγέλλετε* [1 Cor. xi. 26] *καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάστασιν καὶ ἀνάληψιν ὁμολογεῖτε ἄχρις οὗ ἐὰν ἔλθω* (Brightman, i. 133). Comp. Lit. of Copt. Jacobites (*ib.* i. 177); Lit. of St. Basil (*ib.* i. 405); and Lit. of St. James (*ib.* i. 52). The recital of the Creed in the Liturgy does not seem to have been customary before the latter half of the fifth century. Its first introduction is

generally attributed to Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch, 471–488, whose example was followed at Constantinople by Timothy, 511–517. The custom spread but slowly. From Spain, after the third Council of Toledo, 589, it passed into Gaul and England, and finally was adopted at Rome in the eleventh century. The original Nicene Creed was supplanted by the "Constantinopolitan" during the sixth century. The recital of a creed at services other than the Eucharist cannot be traced earlier than the ninth century. It was then said at Prime, and from thence, at the Reformation, passed into the English daily Mattins.

201 *τὴν ἀναίμακτον τελοῦμεν λατρείαν.* For the phrase comp. Lit. of St. Jas., *ἀναίμακτος θυσία*; and again, Lit. of Syr. Jacobites, Brightman, i. 53, 87. This argument from the Eucharist was frequently used in the Christological controversies, and has its own importance.* Thus Cyril reasons that we should not eat Christ's Flesh in the Sacrament unless we believed it to be the Flesh of God, and therefore Life-giving. The Hypostatic Union is shown from the purpose of the Sacrament.

Leo again (Epist. 59, Serm. 91) argued against Eutyches that we should not communicate unless we believed Christ's Flesh there received to be most true and real.†

* See Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 274, who cites the Epist. ad Caesar. apud Routh Opusc. ii. 128; Gelasius de duab. Nat. in Chr. adv. Eutych. et Nest. *ibid.* ii. 139; Augustine; Ephraim of Theopolis; Rupert of Deutz; and Leontius of Byzantium. But the parallelism was already a matter of Christian teaching in Justin Martyr's day (Apol. i. 66).

† "In quibus isti ignorantiae tenebris in quo hactenus desidiae torpore jacuere ut nec auditu discerent vel lectione cognoscerent quod in ecclesia Dei in omnium ore tam consonum est, ut nec ab infantium linguis veritas corporis et sanguinis Christi inter communionis sacramenta taceatur" (Epist. 59). "Sic sacrae mensae communicare debetis ut nihil prorsus

Christ's Perfect Manhood is shown from the fact of the Communion.

Theodoret (Dialog. ii. *Inconfusus*) argued the co-existence of the Two Perfect Natures in Christ from the fact that the consecrated elements retain their nature as bread and wine.

A higher part is united to a lower. The Bread is related to Christ's Body in the Sacrament as the Manhood is to the Godhead in Christ's Personality. Both really exist, and both are distinct. But, as in the case of the analogy of the union of body and soul, so here: the illustration must not be pressed beyond the point that both the hypostatic and the sacramental unions are mysteriously real (Bright, Later Treat., p. 208). The absorption of the Humanity by the Godhead (Eutychianism) would imply a corresponding annihilation of the properties of bread and wine. The early Church never ventured to attempt any definition on the real mystery of the hypostatic or the sacramental union. While the reality of the union in each case was firmly held, the mode of the union was declared to be ineffable.

218 Τὰς δέ γε ἐν τ. εὐ., κ.τ.λ. On this reference of the Gospel sayings to the Two distinct Natures of Christ, see Hilary Poit. de Trin. ix. 5, 6. He further distinguishes three periods in the Word's existence, to each of which certain expressions are properly to be referred:—the pre-

de veritate corporis Christi et sanguinis ambigatis. Hoc enim ore sumitur quod fide creditur, et frustra ab illis AMEN respondetur, a quibus contra id quod accipitur, disputatur" (Serm. 91). In the first passage there is allusion to the then universal practice of infant communion (see Cypr. de lapsis, 9, 25; Augustin. Serm., 174. 7; de pecc. mer. i. 20. 26; 24. 34; Apost. Const. viii. 13; cp. Bingham, xv. 4. 7); and in the second to the "Amen" said by the recipient in response to the words of delivery.

incarnate (wholly Divine), the incarnate (involving two kinds of expressions applicable to the Two Natures), and the post-resurrection period (when the Manhood is perfected in the Godhead).

243 *κένωσιν*. As has been already remarked, the "abasement" or "emptying" in Cyril's view, as in St. Paul's (Phil. ii. 7), clearly consisted in the condescension involved in the Incarnation. Comp. Schol. 12, Christus est Unus (Pus. ed. vii. 373).* How, being and remaining God, the Son of God yet lived as Man amongst men we cannot with our present faculties explain. The twin truths of His One Personality and His Duality of Natures must be held side by side. Of Perfect Manhood we are able to learn only from His example, and it is perhaps presumptuous to speculate upon any possible analogy between the limitations which certainly exist in *fallen* manhood, and those which may or may not exist in *Perfect* Manhood. Comp. below on Anath. 9.

246 *ὑποστάσει μιᾷ τῇ τοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένῃ*. This phrase must be held to explain the sense in which Cyril used the expression *μία φύσις τοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη* elsewhere, believing it to be Athanasian;† Epist. ad reg. i. 9; adv. Nest. ii. 1; Epist. 1 ad Acac.; Epist. 2 ad

* See further illustrations in Bright's *Waymarks in Church History*, Appendix G.

† The phrase is found in a work, De Incarn. Verbi Dei, which Cyril and others accepted as Athanasius', but which is now regarded "as one of the many [Apollinarian] forgeries circulated under the names of Athanasius, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Julius," etc. (Robertson, *Athanasius*, p. lxv.). The whole passsage is as follows: *Ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν Υἱὸν Θεοῦ καὶ Θεὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, Υἱὸν δὲ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ σάρκα· οὐ δύο φύσεις, τὸν ἕνα Υἱὸν, μίαν προσκυνητὴν καὶ μίαν ἀπροσκύνητον, ἀλλὰ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην, μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ μιᾷ προσκυνήσει καὶ προσκυνουμένην* (Bened. ed. iii. 1).

Succens.; ad Eulog. By *μία φύσις* he evidently meant that no change took place in the Personality of the Word by His Incarnation. His Divine Person and Nature remained the same, although He had become Man. *Μία φύσις* as thus understood is equivalent to *ἓν πρόσωπον* or *μία ὑπόστασις*. The ambiguity of the word *φύσις* may be illustrated by the use of the English word "nature." In each human person there is a union of two "natures"—that of the body and that of the soul, yet both together constitute the one "nature" of man. In Christ alone were Godhead and Manhood united in One Being (see Bright, Later Treat., p. 174). The fact remains that although the phrase was orthodox in Cyril's mouth and with his explanations, its ambiguity was most unfortunate, and subsequently led to misunderstanding and an obstinate adherence by Eutyches to the term *μία φύσις* employed in another sense and unguarded by *σεσαρκωμένη*. In fact, Eutyches' perversion of the Cyrilline expression led to the disuse of *φύσις* in this sense by Catholic writers; and in the Chalcedonian Definition, following Leo's Tome, the distinction, without severance, of the *δύω φύσεις*, duae naturae, in Christ was expressly accentuated.

291 *προχεῖται παρ' αὐτοῦ* (see above, p. 91). The phrase is important, especially as explained by *ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς Δυνάμεως καὶ Σοφίας, κ.τ.λ.*, below, as showing Cyril's views of the Double Procession of the Spirit (cp. Anath. 9).

314 *ἵνα καὶ αὐτὴν τῆς ὑπ. ἡμ. εὐλογήσῃ τὴν ἀρχήν.*

God who came on earth this morn,
In a manger lying,
Hallowed Birth by being born,
Vanquished Death by dying.

320 *Κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος, κ.τ.λ.* So the LXX. of Isaiah xxv. 8 (adding *Κύριος* before *ὁ Θεός*), reversing the meaning of the Hebrew "He hath swallowed up death for ever" (cp. 1 Cor. xv. 54).

323 *οἰκονομικῶς*="in virtue of His Incarnation" (see note below on Epist. ad Joan., p. 174).

THE TWELVE ARTICLES

WITH the exception of the seventh the Twelve Articles deal with points already treated in the Epistle, though the same order of treatment is not observed. They lack the breadth of statement which the Epistle itself displayed, and one may be permitted to regard their composition as an unfortunate mistake, both as a matter of theology and of policy, if, at least, we judge them by their immediate results. It is, at the same time, quite probable that Cyril and the synod saw no other way of bringing home to Nestorius the extreme error of his teaching. But anathemas are not to be lightly used or lightly put by; and although Cyril doubtless meant the Letter to explain the Articles, as a matter of fact the Articles were at once separated from the Letter and dealt with alone. In this dislocation they clearly needed amendment, since they emphasized only one side of the truth, and that in the baldest manner, so that they appeared to John of Antioch, to whom Nestorius sent them, and to others, to lean towards Apollinarianism.* Indeed, it was with difficulty that they were believed to be the genuine work of Cyril. Andrew of Samosata, representing the "Oriental" bishops, attacked them, and Theodoret criticized them in a series of observations which he sent to John. Nestorius put out Twelve

* Theodor. Epist. 112.

counter-Anathemas (which are here printed from Marius Mercator's Latin translation, Mansi, iv. 1099; Hahn, 316).* Andrew for the most part criticized Cyril's unguarded wording, which made it not uneasy for heretical constructions to be put upon them. Theodoret misunderstood Cyril's teaching on the Hypostatic Union, with which he was really in accord, and this misunderstanding underlies all his criticisms. Nestorius, with the exception of the last counter-anathema, merely re-emphasized his own blunders.

Cyril replied to Andrew (Apol. adv. Orientales) and to Theodoret (Apol. adv. Theodor.), and wrote at length in refutation of Nestorius (Tom. v. contr. Nest.). Later, about August, 431, he wrote a further "Explanation" of the Anathemas.

The following notes are written in the light of these subsequent writings, and with the help of Dr. Bright's analysis in Later Treatises, pp. 158 foll. The Anathemas are printed again in full for convenience.

ARTICLE I.

Cyril. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ Θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θεοτόκον τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον· γεγέννηκε γὰρ σαρκικῶς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον· ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Nestorius' Counter-anathema. Si quis eum qui est Emmanuel, Deum Verbum† esse dixerit et non potius nobiscum Deum, hoc est, inhabitasse eam quae secundum nos est naturam per id quod unitus est massae nostrae, quam de Maria virgine suscepit, matrem etiam Dei Verbi,

* The texts vary in a few places. I have followed Hahn.
† *Mansi*, Verum.

et non potius ejus qui Emmanuel est sanctam virginem nuncupaverit ipsumque Deum Verbum in carnem versum esse, quam accepit ad ostentationem deitatis suae ut habitu inveniretur ut homo, anathema sit.

Theodoret. Inasmuch as Divinity is immutable, God the Word was not made flesh by nature nor changed into flesh, but He took flesh and tabernacled in us. Phil. ii. 5 foll. shows that "the form of God" was not changed, but remaining what it was took "the form of a servant." He was not naturally conceived of the Virgin, thus deriving the beginning of His existence from her; but He fashioned for Himself a temple in the Virgin's womb, and was with that which was begotten. The Virgin is Theotokos, not because she bare naturally One who was God, but because she bare man united to the God who had fashioned him. Otherwise God the Word would be a creature of the Holy Spirit (Matt. i. 23). The child is called Immanuel on account of the God who assumed, and the Virgin is Theotokos on account of the union of "the form of God" with the conceived "form of a servant."

Such is the substance of Theodoret's observations—obviously Nestorian, and yet only failing of Catholicity through an inability to realize the impersonality of the human nature assumed by the Word.

Orientals. Σαρκικῶς implies an ordinary natural birth, and that the Word was thereby changed into flesh. "The Word was made Flesh" (John i. 14) is similar to the expressions "made sin" (2 Cor. v. 21) and "made a curse" (Gal. iii. 13), and must not be understood of a literal change.

Cyril's Reply. The Incarnation of course involved no change in the Divine Nature of the Word. He became

Man without ceasing to be God. It was a Union without any confusion, and the formula "Theotokos" guards the truth of the Union. By *σαρκικῶς* was meant *κατὰ σάρκα*, opposed to an Apollinarian *θεικῶς*, and not implying a denial of the mystery of the Virginal Birth. The phrase "made flesh" means "was Incarnate and made Man," born after the Human Nature through the Virgin, and is not on a par with the similar phrases quoted.*

ARTICLE II.

Cyril. *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ σαρκὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἡνῶσθαι τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγον, ἕνα τε εἶναι Χριστὸν μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς, τὸν αὐτὸν δηλόνοτι Θεόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Nestorius. Si quis in Verbi Dei conjunctione, quae ad carnem facta est, de loco in locum mutationem divinae essentiae dixerit factam, ejusque divinae naturae carnem capacem dixerit ac partiliter unitam carni, aut iterum in infinitum incircumscriptam divinae naturae coextenderit carnem ad capiendum Deum, eandemque ipsam naturam et Deum dicat et hominem, anathema sit.

Nestorius evidently thought that Cyril's teaching on the union of the Word with flesh involved either a local change on the part of the Divine Essence or an infinite extension of the flesh to enable it to unite with Deity.

Theodoret. Theodoret admitted One Christ and would call the Selfsame God and Man, but distrusted the new phrase "Hypostatic Union" as hitherto unknown. He suspected it of involving a mixture of the flesh with the Godhead, which would destroy the integrity of each Nature.

* See this point dealt with again very fully in Chr. est Unus, p. 241 foll., Pusey's transl. Libr. Fath.

This anathema was apparently not attacked by Andrew.

Cyril's Reply. Ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν means a union in true Personal Being. There is only One Christ, who is both God and Man. The denial of this has necessitated some phrase that emphasizes the truth.

ARTICLE III.

Cyril. Εἴ τις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Χριστοῦ διαιρεῖ τὰς ὑποστάσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μόνῃ συνάπτων αὐτὰς συναφείᾳ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν αὐθεντίαν ἢ δυναστείαν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον συνόδῳ τῇ καθ' ἕνωσιν φυσικὴν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Nestorius. Si quis non secundum conjunctionem unum dixerit Christum, qui est etiam Emmanuel, sed secundum naturam, ex utraque etiam substantia tam Dei Verbi quam etiam assumpti ab eo hominis unam filii connexionem, quam etiam nunc inconfuse servant, minime confiteatur, anathema sit.

Theodoret. Theodoret complained of the subtlety and obscurity of the distinction drawn by Cyril between *συναφεία* and *σύνοδος*. He particularly objected to the phrase *καθ' ἕνωσιν φυσικήν*, which he understood as implying a union that was involuntary and of necessity, and thus depriving God of His lovingkindness. St. Paul teaches that the "Selfemptying" was a voluntary act. A Union implies a distinct apprehension of the things united; therefore the hypostases or natures of the God who took and of the man who was taken must be called two, although after the Union piety compels us to confess One Christ, just as the two natures of mortal body and immortal soul make one man.

Here we may note that Theodoret was misled, through want of a clear definition of the terms, into confusing the ideas of Person and Nature.

Orientals. In his Epistle to the Monks [cap. 15] Cyril had admitted two Hypostases with which this present Anathema is inconsistent. *Φυσική* implies an ordinary process of nature, and thus robs the Union of its supernatural character.

Cyril's Reply. *Φυσική* means a "real" Union *καθ' ὑπόστασιν*, as opposed to a "moral" or "acquired" one (*ἐν σχέσει, σχετική*), such as Nestorius held to exist. It involves no notion of necessity. The Godhead and the Manhood are distinct, but the Personality is One. The doctrine of the Incarnation is not satisfied by an association of two persons, a Divine and a human.

Note here that Cyril had Athanasian precedent for this use of *φυσική*. Athanasius had spoken of *ἡ ἀσύγχυτος φυσικὴ ἕνωσις τοῦ Λογοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ σάρκα*, contr. Apollin. i. 10; comp. ii. 5, *φυσικὴ γέννησις καὶ ἀλύτος ἕνωσις.*

ARTICLE IV.

Cyril. *Εἴ τις προσώποις δυσὶν ἤγουν ὑποστάσεσι τάς τε ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελικοῖς καὶ ἀποστολικοῖς συγγράμμασι διανέμει φωνάς, ἢ ἐπὶ Χριστῷ παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων λεγομένας, ἢ παρ' αὐτοῦ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ τὰς μὲν ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ παρὰ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον ἰδικῶς νοουμένῳ προσάπτει, τὰς δὲ ὡς θεοπρεπεῖς μόνῳ τῷ ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγῳ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Nestorius. Si quis eas voces, quae tam evangelicis quam epistulis apostolicis, de Christo, qui est utraque, conscriptae sunt, accipiat tanquam de una natura, ipsique Dei Verbo tribuere passiones tentaverit tam carne quam etiam Deitate, anathema sit.

Here again is a want of definition: natura is evidently held to imply its own persona, and two natures to demand two

persons. There is an inability to distinguish between the impassible Divine Nature and a Divine Person with a passible Human Nature.

Theodoret. Theodoret assumed that Cyril taught a mixture of the Word with Manhood, and hence was driven to ascribe both the God-befitting and man-befitting terms respecting Christ to One Person. This, he thought, was to degrade the Word, as Arius and Eunomius did, inasmuch as the man-befitting terms belonged to the "form of the servant," not to the "form of God." He then quoted a number of texts to enforce his argument: Matt. xxvii. 48, xxvi. 39; John xii. 27; Mark xiii. 22; Matt. xxiv. 36 on the one side: and John xvi. 15; Matt. xx. 18, 19; John viii. 26 on the other.

Theodoret was here grappling with the difficulty of the κένωσις without the help of the Personal Union to guide him.

Orientals. The complete Union is granted, but there is no confusion of the Godhead with the Manhood, otherwise the former is degraded, and that would be Arianism.

Cyril's Reply. Cyril emphatically disclaimed all notion of mixture or confusion. He admitted the distinction of the Scriptural terms, but showed that whether Divinely or Humanly spoken they referred to the One Person of Christ. The texts implying humiliation belonged to the Word in virtue of His Incarnation; He became Man, and therefore spoke and felt as Man.

If the Orientals agreed with him as to the Personal Union they could not object to Theotokos, which asserted it.

Note that in Cyril's anathema προσώπον is used synonymously with ὑπόστασις for "Person" (see note on Nicene Anathemas, page 52).

Note also that the last words in the Formulary of Reunion (Epist. ad Joan.) admit the distribution of Gospel sayings to the Two different Natures, while ascribing them all to One Person.

ARTICLE V.

Cyril. *Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν θεοφόρον ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ οὐχι δὴ μᾶλλον Θεὸν εἶναι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν, ὡς Υἱὸν ἕνα καὶ φύσει, καθὸ γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ Λόγος καὶ κεκοινώνηκε παραπλησίως ἡμῖν αἵματος καὶ σαρκὸς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Nestorius. Si quis post assumptionem hominis naturaliter Dei Filium unum esse audet dicere, cum sit et Emmanuel, anathema sit.

Theodoret. Certainly God the Word shared with us in blood and flesh and soul; but He was not changed into flesh. The very word "sharing" implies distinction of the two. We worship Him that took and that which was taken as One Son. The term *θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος* is not objectionable: it was used by Basil the Great. It does not mean that Christ was a man endowed with some particular divine grace, but with all the Godhead of the Son (Coloss. ii. 8, 9).

Here we must note that Theodoret first states a truism, and then falls into an error of fact. Θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος (= a God-bearing man; *i.e.* a human person carrying God) was a distinctly Nestorian phrase,* and had not been used by Basil, who wrote ἡ θεοφόρος σάρξ, de Spirit. Sanct. 12; and ἄνθρωπον Θεὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, Hom. in Psal. xlix. These terms were orthodox; just as Athanasius had written Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεός

* Cyril. contr. Nest. iv. 1; v. pro. It was also closely allied to a form of Sabellianism which had been combated by Athanasius. See Orat. c. Ar. iv. 20, εἰ μὲν οὖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὃν ἐφόρεσεν ὁ Λόγος, αὐτὸν εἶναι λέγουσι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, καὶ μὴ τὸν Λόγον Υἱόν· κ.τ.λ.

ἐστι σάρκα φορῶν, Or. c. Ar. iii. 51. Comp. the decrees of the Illyrian synod in 371 apud Theodor. H.E. iv. 8, ὁμολογοῦμεν . . . Θεὸν ὄντα σαρκοφόρον, καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπον θεοφόρον.

The Easterns do not appear to have objected to this and the following Anathema.

Cyril's Reply. No change of the Word into flesh is implied: but *θεοφόρος* might be applied to any saint in whom God dwells.

ARTICLE VI.

Cyril. *Εἴ τις λέγει Θεὸν ἢ Δεσπότην εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγον, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖ Θεόν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, ὡς γεγονότος σαρκὸς τοῦ Λόγου κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Nestorius. Si quis post incarnationem Deum Verbum alterum quempiam praeter Christum nominaverit, servi sane formam cum Deo Verbo initium non habere et hanc increatam, ut ipse est, esse dicere tentaverit, et non potius ab ipso creatam confiteatur, tamquam a naturali domino et creatore et Deo, quam suscitare propria virtute promisit: Solvite, dicens ad Judaeos, templum hoc et triduo suscitabo illud; anathema sit.

Theodoret. Theodoret quoted Gal. iv. 7; John xv. 15; Isaiah vii. 14, ix. 6 to prove that after the Union, although the "form of servant" remained, the name of servitude was no longer used; but even the "form of servant" was called God on account of the "form of God" united to it. The nature of what was assumed is shown by Isaiah xlix. 3, 5, 6 to be "form of servant," and it was this which was "formed from the womb."

The point of these observations is not very clear. Perhaps Theodoret felt that, in so far as the "form of servant" was

created in the Virgin's womb, there was a sense in which the Word was God and Lord of it. But he could not express this, because he did not distinctly grasp the unity of Person in the Word and His Manhood.

Cyril's Reply. There is no dualism; Christ is One Person to whom, as Man, the term of servitude belongs. He cannot be God and Lord of Himself.

Note that a distinction is to be drawn between Christ being God and Lord of a human person associated with Himself, which involves a dualism, and His being God and Lord of His Own Manhood.

ARTICLE VII.

Cyril. *Εἴ τις φησὶν, ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἐνηργῆσθαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς εὐδοξίαν περιῆφθαι, ὡς ἑτέρῳ παρ' αὐτὸν ὑπάρχοντι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Nestorius. Si quis hominem, qui de virgine creatus est, hunc esse dixerit Unigenitum, qui ex utero Patris ante luciferum natus est, non magis propter unitionem ad eum qui est Unigenitus naturaliter Patris, Unigeniti cum appellatione confiteatur eumque participem magis factum, Jesum quoque alterum quempiam praeter Emmanuel dicat, anathema sit.

Theodoret. Since man's nature is mortal and God the Word raised up the temple of His body and glorified it, the "form of the servant" is glorified through the "form of God" (Eph. i. 19, 20).

Orientals. Christ was not "energized" as the saints were, but yet St. Paul speaks of *ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐνήργηκεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν* (*loc. cit.*).

Cyril's Reply. Christ is not "energized" from without; He

is Himself the Word who "energizes." His resurrection is claimed as His Own work (John ii. 19), and it was in His Human Nature only that He was glorified.

ARTICLE VIII.

Cyril. Εἴ τις τολμᾷ λέγειν τὸν ἀναληφθέντα ἄνθρωπον συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι δεῖν τῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ καὶ συνδοξάζεσθαι καὶ συγχρηματίζειν Θεὸν, ὡς ἕτερον ἐν ἑτέρῳ·* τὸ γὰρ Σὺν ἀεὶ προστιθέμενον τοῦτο νοεῖν ἀναγκάσει· καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον μιᾷ προσκυνήσει τιμᾷ τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, καὶ μίαν αὐτῷ τὴν δοξολογίαν ἀναπέμπει, καθὸ γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ Λόγος, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Nestorius. Si quis servi formam per se ipsam, hoc est, secundum propriae naturae rationem colendam esse dixerit et omnium rerum dominam esse, et non potius per societatem, qua beatae et ex se naturaliter dominicae Unigeniti naturae conjuncta et connexa est, veneratur, anathema sit.

Theodoret. We offer only one doxology to the Lord Christ, who is at once God and Man; but the properties of the Natures are distinct, for the Word did not change into flesh, nor was the man transmuted into God.

Orientals. We do not recognize two Persons or two Sons, but One Son, whom we adore.

Cyril's Reply. Any phrase that involves the notion of a duality of persons is wrong. [*e.g.* ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἄνθρωπος,

* This expression is peculiar. Nowhere else in this connexion does Cyril write ἐν ἑτέρῳ, and the ἐν seems to be an intrusion, perhaps due to a mistaken reduplication of the last two letters of the preceding word. We must translate, with Marius Mercator (who cannot have read ἐν), tamquam alterum *cum* altero, "as if one person *with* another" [so Dr. Bright in a private letter to the present editor]. Fleury ("comme l'un étant en l'autre") and P. E. Pusey ("as one in another") miss the point of the emphasis on σύν.

"the man assumed," and Theodoret's antithesis of "the Word" and "the man"; both of which phrases involve a human personality side by side with the Divine.]

Note that this anathema was adopted in an expanded form by the Fifth General Council (see Anath. ix. below, p. 182), and also that Athanasius had already dealt with this question of the one worship of the Incarnate Son, Epist. ad Adelph. 3, Οὐ κτίσμα προσκυνοῦμεν· μὴ γένοιτο· κ.τ.λ.

ARTICLE IX.

Cyril. Εἴ τις φησὶ τὸν ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δεδοξάσθαι παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ὡς ἀλλοτρίᾳ δυνάμει τῇ δι' αὐτοῦ χρώμενον, καὶ παρ' αὐτου λαβόντα τὸ ἐνεργεῖν δύνασθαι κατὰ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, καὶ τὸ πληροῦν εἰς ἀνθρώπους τὰς θεοσημίας, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα, φησὶ, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐνήργηκε τὰς θεοσημίας, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Nestorius. Si quis formae servi consubstantiatem esse dixerit Spiritum Sanctum et non potius per illius mediationis, quae est ad Deum Verbum ab ipsa conceptione, habuisse dixerit copulationem seu conjunctionem, per quam in homines communes simul nonnunquam miserandas curationes exercuit, et ex hoc fugandorum spirituum eveniebat esse potestatem, anathema sit.

Theodoret. Theodoret accused Cyril of anathematizing prophets, apostles, Gabriel, and Christ Himself, citing a number of texts which speak of Christ as anointed by the Spirit. He then proceeded to admit one-half of Cyril's contention by urging that it was not God the Word who was formed and anointed, but the Human Nature which He assumed. He also admitted that the Spirit was the Word's Own as being of the same Nature (ὁμοφυές) and proceeding from the Father, but denied

that He had ἐξ Υἱοῦ ἢ δι' Υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν. Such a statement would be blasphemous and contrary to Christ's words, τὸ Πνεῦμα ὁ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται (John xv. 26).

Note first that Theodoret imagined that Cyril denied the anointing of the Manhood of the Word, and secondly that he misquoted John xv. 26 by substituting ἐκ for παρά.

Orientals. Two points were put forward. First, Cyril had at first, in his Epistle to the Monks, admitted that Christ was influenced and even quickened by the Spirit of God; comp. Matt. xii. 28. Secondly, the emphasis laid on the Spirit being Christ's own tended towards a distinction being made in the "common" action of the Three Persons of the Trinity. They admitted that Christ's miracles were wrought both by His own power (τῇ οἰκείᾳ δυνάμει) and by the Spirit's energy.

Cyril's Reply. He intended the anathema to exclude the notion, which Nestorius seemed to hold, that the action of the Spirit upon Christ was like in kind to His action on ordinary men. The Spirit was His own Spirit, for although He proceeds from the Father He is not alien from the Son (οὐκ ἀλλότριον ἐστὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ); and since "*all* that the Father hath" is the Son's too, therefore the Spirit is His. He wrought the miracles, having as His own the Spirit, who is ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐσιωδῶς ἐμπεφυκὸς αὐτῷ (Explic. xii.). Comp. contr. Nest. iv. 1.

For the bearing of this upon Cyril's views as to the eternal derivation of the Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father, see the note above on *Filioque*, page 91.

ARTICLE X.

Cyril. Ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἀπόστολον τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν γεγενῆσθαι Χριστὸν ἡ θεία λέγει γραφή, προσκεκόμικε δὲ

ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρί. εἴ τις τοίνυν ἀρχιερέα φησὶ καὶ ἀπόστολον ἡμῶν γενέσθαι, οὐκ αὐτὸν τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ Λόγον, ὅτε γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος· ἀλλ' ὡς ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὸν ἰδικῶς ἄνθρωπον ἐκ γυναικός· ἢ εἴ τις λέγει καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ προσενεγκεῖν αὐτὸν τὴν προσφορὰν, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ μόνων ἡμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐδεήθη προσφορᾶς ὁ μὴ εἰδὼς ἁμαρτίαν· ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Nestorius. Si quis illud in principio Verbum pontificem et apostolum confessionis nostrae factum esse seque ipsum obtulisse pro nobis dicat, et non Emmanuelis esse apostolatum potius dixerit oblationemque secundum eandem dividat rationem ei, qui univit, et illi, qui unitus est ad unam societatem Filii, hoc est, Deo, quae Dei sunt, et homini, quae sunt hominis, non deputans, anathema sit.

Theodoret. It was not God the Word, but the human nature assumed by Him that took the name of the priesthood of Melchizedek, and experienced the feelings of our mortal nature. It is heterodox to confuse God the Word with him who, as our High Priest, offered himself on our behalf, and who had in himself the Word both united to him and inseparably conjoined.

Note how easily Theodoret slips from speaking of the impersonal human nature into giving it a separate human personality.

Orientals. The Orientals practically agree with Cyril. Christ is our High Priest; His Humanity is the sphere of His priesthood.

Cyril's Reply. After citing some words from Nestorius which he deemed heretical, Cyril proceeded to emphasize the particular point intended by this anathema, namely, that our High Priest is God the Word Incarnate. There

was no advancement of a man towards moral union with the Word. Christ's Human Nature brought upon Him the function of Priest, but He exercised it as the Word of God. Comp. contr. Nest. iii. 3.

ARTICLE XI.

Cyril. *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου σάρκα ζωοποιὸν εἶναι καὶ ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς Λόγου· ἀλλ' ὡς ἑτέρου τινὸς παρ' αὐτὸν, συνημμένου μὲν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν ὡς μόνην θείαν ἐνοίκησιν ἐσχηκότος, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον ζωοποιὸν, ὡς ἔφημεν, ὅτι γέγονεν ἰδία τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ τὰ πάντα ζωογονεῖν ἰσχύοντος, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Nestorius. Si quis unitam carnem Verbo Dei ex naturae propriae possibilitate vivificatricem esse dixerit ipso Domino et Deo pronunciante: Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro nihil prodest, anathema sit. Spiritus est Deus, a Domino pronunciatum est. Si quis ergo Deum Verbum carnaliter secundum substantiam carnem factum esse dicat, hoc autem modo et specialiter custodite, maxime Domino Christo post resurrectionem discipulis suis dicente: Palpate et videte, quoniam spiritus ossa et carnem non habet sicut me videtis habere, anathema sit.

Theodoret. Theodoret detected Apollinarianism lurking in the mention of flesh only, without express mention of the soul and the perfect manhood. The flesh was of course the Word's own, being the assumed nature, and is lifegiving because of its union with the Godhead.

Orientals. The reiteration of *ἰδίαν . . . ἰδία*, which lays stress on its being the own flesh of the Word, looks like Apollinarianism, as though His flesh was not of human origin. Again, since Cyril had admitted that the Manhood was glorified by the Spirit, it is out of place to reject the phrase *συνημμένος αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν.*

Cyril's Reply. The emphasis laid upon the flesh being Christ's own is to prevent Nestorius attributing it to a separate human person (comp. contr. Nest. iv. 6). He himself entirely rejected the idea that Christ's flesh was of heavenly origin.

"Flesh" is used, John i. 14, to mean the whole of man, and it is used in the Anathema in the same sense, not as excluding "soul."

ARTICLE XII.

Cyril. *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον παθόντα σαρκὶ καὶ ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ καὶ θανάτου γευσάμενον σαρκὶ, γεγονότα τε πρωτότοκον ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καθὸ ζωή ἐστι καὶ ζωοποιὸς ὡς Θεός, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Nestorius. Si quis confitens passiones carnis has quoque Verbo Dei et carne simul in qua facta est, sine discretione dignitatis naturarum tribuerit, anathema sit.

Theodoret. The passible only can suffer; therefore it was the "form of the servant" that suffered, although the "form of God" made its sufferings its own on account of the union. It was not the (Divine) Christ who suffered, but the man assumed by God.

Note here that while Nestorius is orthodox, Theodoret is not, as he again distinguishes two persons.

Orientals. How could the Word suffer? Cyril had himself admitted the impassibility of the Godhead. To say "God suffered in flesh" is inadequate, as it still implies that God was passible, and this is either Patripassianism or Arianism, a degradation of Deity.

Cyril's Reply. To suffer in flesh does not involve suffering in Godhead. The Word could not suffer as God, but only as having become passible Man. It is the Personal

Union of One who is God with Human Nature that makes the Atonement efficacious.

Note that the lack of any qualification in this Anathema, such as that in the Epistle itself, which affirms the impassibility of the Word in His own Nature, laid Cyril justly open to the charge of holding that the Deity suffered; and this was eagerly seized upon by those who were on the look-out for signs of Apollinarianism. Theopaschite language of the strongest kind was common enough in early writers (see Lightfoot's note, Clement ii. 15) in order to emphasize the real Deity of Christ, but it had its own dangers. By Gnostics it might be perverted to imply passibility in the Godhead; by Apollinarians and Monophysites to denote the obliteration of the Human Nature; and by Sabellians to destroy the distinction of Persons within the Trinity. Athanasius was more cautious; comp. *e.g.* Or. c. Ar. iii. 32, *ὅθεν τῆς σαρκὸς πασχούσης οὐκ ἦν ἐκτὸς ταύτης ὁ Λόγος· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται καὶ τὸ πάθος, κ.τ.λ.* On the Apollinarian "degradation of Deity to a condition of suffering," see Athan. contr. Apoll. ii. 12.

THE EPISTLE OF CYRIL TO JOHN OF ANTIOCH

INTRODUCTION

On receipt of the letters from Caelestine and Cyril Nestorius preached a sermon admitting the use of Theotokos alongside of Anthropotokos, but preferring Christotokos. He then framed the twelve counter-Anathemas to Cyril's, which have been already commented on, and secured the support of John of Antioch, Andrew of Samosata, and Theodoret of Cyrrhos. Andrew and Theodoret, as we have seen, wrote against the Twelve Articles, and Cyril replied, composing also Five Tomes in refutation of Nestorius' sermons.

In June, 431, the prelates were assembling at Ephesus for the great Council. Some of them, John of Antioch and his party, were late. Cyril, eager to vindicate the truth, and perhaps betraying some want of faith and patience, insisted on opening the Synod on June 22. Nestorius refused to appear. Cyril's Second Letter was read and approved, and Nestorius' reply condemned. The Letter of Caelestine to Nestorius, and Cyril's Third Letter with the Anathemas, were then read and inserted in the Acts. They were accepted as orthodox, although no special acclamations of approval are recorded.* The

* Mansi, iv. 1139. The Easterns certainly believed that the Council had approved of Cyril's Articles (see their second petition to the Emperor, Mansi, v. 403), and such was the belief of the Commissioners at Chalcedon, Sess. i., Mansi, vi. 937. Both were probably in error.

deposition of Nestorius followed. A Synodal Letter to Theodosius informed him of all that had been done, and that the Council had found that the Epistles (ἐπιστόλας) of Cyril agreed with the Nicene Creed. Nestorius also wrote inveighing against the Council's actions.

On June 27 John and the Easterns arrived, held a separate council, deposed Cyril and Memnon of Ephesus, and excommunicated the rest pending their condemnation of Cyril's Anathemas. A record of their proceedings was also sent to the Emperor.

Two days later the true Council was severely reprimanded in a letter from the Emperor, and its acts annulled.

After the arrival of the Roman legates early in July several further sessions were held, and John of Antioch was excommunicated.* The Emperor and the Pope were

* The following is the text of the Synodal Epistle:—

Ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ συγκροτηθεῖσα ἐκ θεσπίσματος τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων βασιλέων τοῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τε καὶ πόλιν ἐπισκόποις πρεσβυτέροις διακόνοις καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ.

Συναχθέντων ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸ εὐσεβὲς γράμμα ἐν τῃ Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλει, ἀπέστησάν τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν, ὄντες τὸν ἀριθμὸν τριάκοντα μικρῷ πρὸς, ἔξαρχον τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἀποστασίας ἐσχηκότες τὸν τῆς Ἀντιοχέων ἐπίσκοπον Ἰωάννην· ὧν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστι ταῦτα. πρῶτος οὗτος Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἀντιοχείας τῆς Συρίας, καὶ Ἰωάννης Δαμασκοῦ, Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀπαμείας, Ἀλέξανδρος Ἱεραπόλεως, Ἱμέριος Νικομηδείας, Φριτιλᾶς Ἡρακλείας, Ἑλλάδιος Ταρσοῦ, Μαξιμῖνος Ἀναζάρβου, Θεόδωρος Μαρκιανουπόλεως, Πέτρος Τραϊανουπόλεως, Παῦλος Ἐμίσης, Πολυχρόνιος Ἡρακλειωτῶν πόλεως, Εὐθύριος Τυάνων, Μελέτιος Νεοκαισαρείας, Θεοδώρητος Κύρου, Ἀπρίγγιος Καλχηδόνος, Μακάριος Λαοδικείας τῆς μεγάλης, Ζῶσυς Ἐσβοῦντος, Σαλούστιος Κωρύκου Κιλικίας, Ἡσύχιος Κασταβάλης Κιλικίας, Οὐαλεντῖνος Μουτλοβλάκης, Εὐστάθιος Παρνασοῦ, Φίλιππος Θεοδοσιανῶν, Δανιὴλ τε, καὶ Δεξιανὸς, Ἰουλιανός τε, καὶ Κύριλλος, Ὀλύμπιός τε, καὶ Διογένης, Πολιὸς, Θεοφάνης Φιλαδελφείας, Τραϊανὸς Αὐγούστης, Αὐρήλιος Εἰρηνουπόλεως, Μουσαῖος Ἀράδου, Ἑλλάδιος Πτολεμαΐδος· οἵ τινες τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας μηδεμίαν ἔχοντες ἄδειαν ὡς ἐξ αὐθεντίας ἱερατικῆς, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαί τινας ἐκ ταύτης βλάπτειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν, διὰ τὸ καί τινας ἐν αὐτοῖς εἶναι καθῃρημένους, πρὸ πάντων μὲν τὰ Νεστορίου

informed of these actions, but Theodosius sent a commissioner, Count John, with full powers and a letter which betrayed an entire misunderstanding of the position of affairs. It assented to the deposition of Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius, who were thereupon placed under arrest. A demonstration of Monks at Constantinople awakened Theodosius to his mistake, and in September a deputation from each party met him at Chalcedon. He ordered a new patriarch to be consecrated for Constantinople, and the rest of the prelates to return to their homes. John of Antioch continued to condemn Cyril and his supporters, and the Emperor endeavoured in vain to effect a reconciliation by means of a conference. An Antiochene council framed six Articles * in opposition to Cyril's, who replied that he insisted only on Nestorius' condemnation, and explained that his own Articles meant nothing but a rejection of Nestorian tenets. He anathematized Apollinarius and all other heretics. John was now satisfied, but the "Easterns" wavered. Eventually Paul of Emisa was sent to confer with Cyril. Confessions of faith were interchanged, and the terms of reunion embodied in a letter addressed to Cyril. This was sent to Antioch for John to subscribe; it included the condemnation of Nestorius' writings and the recognition of his

καὶ τὰ Κελεστίου φρονήματα ἐπιφερόμενοι σαφέστατα ἀπεδείχθησαν, ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ἑλέσθαι μεθ' ἡμῶν Νεστορίου καταψηφίσασθαι· οὕς τινας δόγματι κοινῷ ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος πάσης μὲν ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἀλλοτρίους ἐποίησε, πᾶσαν δὲ αὐτῶν ἐνέργειαν ἱερατικὴν περιεῖλε, δι' ἧς ἠδύναντο βλάπτειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν τινάς.

* "We adhere to the Nicene Creed and the exposition of it by the blessed Athanasius in his letter to Epictetus. But the new dogmas, advanced in certain letters or articles, we reject as calculated to create disturbance." So ran the first article, the only one now extant (Fleury, Oxf. trans. iii. 155).

successor at Constantinople. After a little time, under pressure from the Court, John agreed, and Cyril announced the restoration of communion on April 23, 433. He then wrote the following Letter ("Laetentur caeli") to John, inserting in it the Formulary of Reunion.

ANALYSIS OF CYRIL'S EPISTLE TO JOHN OF ANTIOCH

A. *Introduction.* The happiness of peace.

The visit of Paul of Emisa.

B. *Doctrinal.* It is now clear that dissension was unnecessary.

The Formulary of Reunion.

The Nicene Creed is sufficient, yet, as expressive of our convictions,

We confess

Jesus Christ, Perfect God and Perfect Man,

Co-essential with the Father as to Godhead,

And with us as to Manhood: in Union of Two Natures One Christ.

The Virgin is Theotokos, because from the moment of conception Her Offspring was God the Word. There is a Unity of Person with distinction of Natures, as the Gospel sayings imply.

I am accused of saying that the Flesh of Christ came down from heaven; but this is excluded by my insistence upon Theotokos, and by the words of Isaiah vii. 14, and of Gabriel, Luke i. 30 and Matt. i. 23.

We say that Christ came down from heaven, following St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 47), because He is One with His own flesh which was born of the Virgin. The Word in His own Nature is unchangeable and unalterable.

There was no mixture, or confusion, or blending. He, impassible, suffered for us in the flesh by an "oeconomic" appropriation. We follow the Fathers, especially Athanasius, and the unalterable Nicene Symbol.

C. *Conclusion.* You will know how to treat our calumniators.

We send you a correct copy of Athanasius' Epistle to Epictetus, since many of the current copies are corrupt.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ
ΚΥΡΙΛΛΟΥ
ΠΡΟΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΝ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΕΙΑΣ

Κυρίῳ μου ἀγαπητῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ Ἰωάννῃ Κύριλλος ἐν κυρίῳ χαίρειν

Psalm xcv. 11. Eph. ii. 14.

ΕΥΦΡΑΙΝΕΣΘΩΣΑΝ οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσθω ἡ γῆ· λέλυται γὰρ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ καὶ πέπαυται τὸ λυποῦν καὶ διχονοίας ἁπάσης ἀνήρηται τρόπος, τοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν Σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ ἐκκλησίαις τὴν εἰρήνην βραβεύοντος· κεκληκότων δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο ἡμᾶς καὶ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφιλεστάτων βασιλέων· οἳ προγονικῆς εὐσεβείας ἄριστοι ζηλωταὶ γεγονότες, ἀσφαλῆ μὲν καὶ ἀκατάσειστον ἐν ἰδίαις ψυχαῖς τὴν ὀρθὴν φυλάττουσι πίστιν· ἐξαίρετον δὲ ποιοῦνται φροντίδα τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν, ἵνα καὶ διαβόητον ἔχωσιν εἰς αἰῶνα τὴν δόξαν, καὶ εὐκλεεστάτην ἀποφήνωσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν βασιλείαν· οἷς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν δυνάμεων Κύριος πλουσίᾳ χειρὶ διανέμει τὰ ἀγαθά· καὶ δίδωσι μὲν κατακρατεῖν τῶν ἀνθεστηκότων, χαρίζεται δὲ τὸ νικᾶν. οὐ γὰρ ἂν διαψεύσαιτο λέγων

1 Sam ii. 30.

Ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος· ὅτι τοὺς δοξάζοντάς με δοξάσω.

Ἀφικομένου τοίνυν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ Παύλου, θυμηδίας ἐμπεπλήσμεθα καὶ σφόδρα εἰκότως, ὡς ἀνδρὸς

τοιούτου μεσιτεύοντος, καὶ τοῖς ὑπὲρ δύναμιν πόνοις ἐλομένου προσομιλεῖν, ἵνα τὸν τοῦ διαβόλου νικήσῃ φθόνον, καὶ συνάψῃ τὰ διῃρημένα, καὶ τὰ μεταξὺ διεῤῥιμμένα σκάνδαλα περιελὼν, ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ εἰρήνῃ στεφανώσῃ τάς τε παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ τὰς παρ' ὑμῖν ἐκκλησίας. τίνα μὲν γὰρ διῄρηνται τρόπον, περιττὸν εἰπεῖν· χρῆναι δὲ μᾶλλον ὑπολαμβάνω τὰ τῷ τῆς εἰρήνης πρέποντα καιρῷ καὶ φρονεῖν καὶ λαλεῖν. ἥσθημεν τοίνυν ἐπὶ τῇ συντυχίᾳ τοῦ μνημονευθέντος θεοσεβεστάτου ἀνδρός· ὃς τάχα που καὶ ἀγῶνας ἕξειν οὐ μικροὺς ὑπενόησεν, ἀναπείθων ἡμᾶς ὅτι χρὴ συνάψαι πρὸς εἰρήνην τὰς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἑτεροδόξων ἀφανίσαι γέλωτα, ἀπαμβλῦναί τε πρὸς τούτῳ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου δυστροπίας τὸ κέντρον. ἑτοίμως δὲ οὕτως ἔχοντας εἰς τοῦτο κατέλαβεν, ὡς μηδένα πόνον ὑποστῆναι παντελῶς· μεμνήμεθα γὰρ τοῦ Σωτῆρος λέγοντος Εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι John xiv. 27.
ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν ἀφίημι ὑμῖν. δεδιδάγμεθα δὲ καὶ λέγειν ἐν προσευχαῖς Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Isaiah xxvi. 12.
εἰρήνην δὸς ἡμῖν, πάντα γὰρ ἀπέδωκας ἡμῖν. ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν μεθέξει γένοιτο τῆς παρὰ Θεοῦ χορηγουμένης εἰρήνης, ἀνενδεὴς ἔσται παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ.

Ὅτι δὲ περιττὴ παντελῶς καὶ οὐκ εὐάφορμος τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἡ διχοστασία γέγονε, νυνὶ μάλιστα πεπληροφορήμεθα, τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου Παύλου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου χάρτην προκομίσαντος, ἀδιάβλητον ἔχοντα τῆς πίστεως τὴν ὁμολογίαν, καὶ ταύτην συντετάχθαι διαβεβαιουμένου παρά τε τῆς σῆς ὁσιότητος καὶ τῶν αὐτόθι θεοσεβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως ἡ συγγραφὴ, καὶ αὐταῖς λέξεσιν ἐντέθειται τῇδε ἡμῶν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ.

Περὶ δὲ τῆς θεοτόκου παρθένου ὅπως καὶ φρονοῦμεν καὶ λέγομεν, τοῦ τε τρόπου τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναγκαίως, οὐκ ἐν προσθήκης μέρει, ἀλλ' ἐν πληροφορίας εἴδει, ὡς ἄνωθεν ἔκ τε τῶν θείων γραφῶν, ἔκ τε τῆς παραδόσεως τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων παρειληφότες ἐσχήκαμεν, διὰ

βραχέων ἐροῦμεν, οὐδὲν τὸ συνόλον προστιθέντες τῇ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἐκτεθείσῃ πίστει. ὡς γὰρ ἔφθημεν εἰρηκότες, πρὸς πᾶσαν ἐξαρκεῖ καὶ εὐσεβείας γνῶσιν, καὶ πάσης αἱρετικῆς κακοδοξίας ἀποκήρυξιν. ἐροῦμεν δὲ οὐ κατατολμῶντες τῶν ἀνεφίκτων, ἀλλὰ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ τῆς οἰκείας ἀσθενείας, ἀποκλείοντες τοῖς ἐπιφύεσθαι βουλομένοις, ἐν οἷς τὰ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον διασκεπτόμεθα.

Ὁμολογοῦμεν τοιγαροῦν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Μονογενῆ, Θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονε· διὸ ἕνα Χριστὸν, ἕνα Υἱὸν, ἕνα Κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν. κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀσυγχύτου ἑνώσεως ἔννοιαν ὁμολογοῦμεν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον θεοτόκον, διὰ τὸ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον σαρκωθῆναι καὶ ἐνανθρωπῆσαι, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συλλήψεως ἑνῶσαι ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς ληφθέντα ναόν. τὰς δὲ εὐαγγελικὰς καὶ ἀποστολικὰς περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνὰς, ἴσμεν τοὺς θεολόγους ἄνδρας, τὰς μὲν κοινοποιοῦντας, ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς προσώπου, τὰς δὲ διαιροῦντας, ὡς ἐπὶ δύο φύσεων· καὶ τὰς μὲν θεοπρεπεῖς κατὰ τὴν θεότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὰς δὲ ταπεινὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα παραδιδόντας.

Ταύταις ὑμῶν ἐντυχόντες ταῖς ἱεραῖς φωναῖς, οὕτω τε καὶ
Eph. iv. 5. ἑαυτοὺς φρονοῦντας εὑρίσκοντες· εἷς γὰρ Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα· ἐδοξάσαμεν τὸν τῶν ὅλων Σωτῆρα Θεόν· ἀλλήλοις συγχαίροντες, ὅτι ταῖς θεοπνεύστοις γραφαῖς καὶ τῇ παραδόσει τῶν ἁγίων ἡμῶν πατέρων, συμβαίνουσαν ἔχουσι πίστιν αἵ τε παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ αἱ παρ' ὑμῖν ἐκκλησίαι· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐπυθόμην τῶν φιλοψογεῖν εἰωθότων τινὰς, σφηκῶν ἀγρίων δίκην περιβομβεῖν, καὶ μοχθηροὺς ἐρεύγεσθαι κατ' ἐμοῦ λόγους, ὡς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατακομισθὲν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου λέγοντος τὸ

ἅγιον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, δεῖν ᾠήθην ὀλίγα περὶ τούτου πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰπεῖν Ὦ ἀνόητοι καὶ μόνον εἰδότες τὸ συκοφαντεῖν· πῶς εἰς τοῦτο παρηνέχθητε γνώμης καὶ τοσαύτην νενοσήκατε τὴν μωρίαν; ἔδει γὰρ ἔδει σαφῶς ἐννοεῖν, ὅτι σχεδὸν ἅπας ἡμῖν ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ἀγὼν συγκεκρότηται, διαβεβαιουμένοις, ὅτι θεοτόκος ἐστὶν ἡ ἁγία παρθένος. ἀλλ᾽ εἴπερ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ αὐτῆς τὸ ἅγιον σῶμα γεγενῆσθαί φαμεν τοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ, πῶς ἂν ἔτι νοοῖτο θεοτόκος; τίνα γὰρ ὅλως τέτοκεν, εἰ μή ἐστιν ἀληθὲς, ὅτι γεγέννηκε κατὰ σάρκα τὸν Ἐμμανουήλ; γελάσθωσαν τοίνυν οἱ ταῦτα περὶ ἐμοῦ πεφλυαρηκότες· οὐ γὰρ ψεύδεται λέγων ὁ μακάριος προφήτης Ἡσαΐας Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, καὶ (Isaiah vii. 14.) τέξεται Υἱὸν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα (Matt. i. 23.) αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ· ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον Μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ Θεὸς, ἀληθεύει δὲ πάντως καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Γαβριὴλ πρὸς τὴν μακαρίαν παρθένον εἰπών Μὴ φοβοῦ (Luke i. 30, 31.) Μαριάμ· εὗρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ, καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. Αὐτὸς γὰρ (Matt. i. 21.) σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

Ὅταν δὲ λέγομεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἄνωθεν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν, οὐχ ὡς ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατενεχθείσης τῆς ἁγίας αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς, τὰ τοιαῦτά φαμεν, ἑπόμενοι δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ θεσπεσίῳ Παύλῳ διακεκραγότι σαφῶς Ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκὸς, (1 Cor. xv. 47.) ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος [ὁ Κύριος] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. μεμνήμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος λέγοντος Οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ (John iii. 13.) οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· καίτοι γεγέννηται κατὰ σάρκα, καθάπερ ἔφην ἀρτίως, ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταφοιτήσας Θεὸς Λόγος κεκένωκεν ἑαυτὸν, μορφὴν (Phil. ii. 7.)

δούλου λαβὼν, καὶ κεχρημάτικεν υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, μετὰ τοῦ μεῖναι ὃ ἦν, τουτέστι Θεός. ἄτρεπτος γὰρ καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος κατὰ φύσιν ἐστίν· ὡς εἷς ἤδη νοούμενος μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ λέγεται κατελθεῖν, ὠνόμασται δὲ [1 Cor. xv. 47.] καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, τέλειος ὢν ἐν θεότητι, καὶ τέλειος ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι ὁ αὐτὸς, καὶ ὡς ἐν ἑνὶ [1 Cor. viii. 6.] προσώπῳ νοούμενος· εἷς γὰρ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, κἂν ἡ τῶν φύσεων μὴ ἀγνοῆται διαφορὰ, ἐξ ὧν τὴν ἀπόῤῥητον ἕνωσιν πεπρᾶχθαι φαμέν.

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας ὅτι κρᾶσις ἢ σύγχυσις ἢ φυρμὸς ἐγένετο τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου πρὸς τὴν σάρκα, καταξιωσάτω ἡ σὴ ὁσιότης ἐπιστομίζειν. εἰκὸς γάρ τινας καὶ ταῦτα περὶ ἐμοῦ θρυλεῖν, ὡς ἢ πεφρονηκότος ἢ εἰρηκότος. ἐγὼ δὲ τοσοῦτον ἀφέστηκα τοῦ φρονῆσαί τι τοιοῦτον, ὥστε καὶ μαίνε- [James i. 17.] σθαι νομίζω τοὺς οἰηθέντας ὅλως, ὅτι τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα περὶ τὴν θείαν τοῦ Λόγου φύσιν συμβῆναι [Mal. iii. 6.] δύναται· μένει γὰρ ὅ ἐστιν ἀεὶ, καὶ οὐκ ἠλλοίωται· ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἀλλοιωθείη πώποτε καὶ μεταβολῆς ἔσται δεκτική. ἀπαθῆ δὲ πρὸς τούτῳ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον ὑπάρχειν ὁμολογοῦμεν ἅπαντες, κἂν εἰ πανσόφως αὐτὸς οἰκονομῶν τὸ μυστήριον, ἑαυτῷ προσνέμων ὁρῷτο τὰ τῇ ἰδίᾳ σαρκὶ συμβεβηκότα πάθη. ταύτῃ τοι καὶ ὁ πάνσοφος [1 Peter iv. 1.] Πέτρος Χριστοῦ οὖν, φησὶ, παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκὶ, καὶ οὐχὶ τῇ φύσει τῆς ἀῤῥήτου θεότητος. ἵνα γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν ὅλων Σωτὴρ εἶναι πιστεύηται, κατ᾽ οἰκείωσιν οἰκονομικὴν εἰς ἑαυτὸν, ὡς ἔφην, τὰ τῆς ἰδίας σαρκὸς ἀναφέρει πάθη· ὁποῖόν ἐστι τὸ διὰ τῆς τοῦ προφήτου [Isaiah l. 6.] φωνῆς προαναφωνούμενον, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ Τὸν νῶτόν μου δέδωκα εἰς μάστιγας, τὰς δὲ σιαγόνας μου εἰς ῥαπίσματα, τὸ δὲ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ἀπέστρεψα ἀπὸ αἰσχύνης ἐμπτυσμάτων.

Ὅτι δὲ ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων δόξαις ἑπόμεθα πανταχοῦ, μάλιστα δὲ ταῖς τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ πανευφήμου πατρὸς

ἡμῶν Ἀθανασίου, τὸ κατά τι γοῦν ὅλως ἔξω φέρεσθαι παραιτούμενοι, πεπείσθω μὲν ἡ σὴ ὁσιότης, ἐνδοιαζέτω δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μηδείς. παρέθηκα δ' ἂν καὶ χρήσεις αὐτῶν πολλὰς, τοὺς ἐμαυτοῦ λόγους ἐξ αὐτῶν πιστούμενος, εἰ μὴ τὸ μῆκος ἐδεδίειν τοῦ γράμματος, μὴ ἄρα πως γένηται διὰ τοῦτο προσκορές. κατ' οὐδένα δὲ τρόπον σαλεύεσθαι παρὰ τινῶν ἀνεχόμεθα τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν πίστιν, ἤτοι τὸ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον, παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἡμῶν πατέρων, τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων κατὰ καιρούς· οὔτε μὴν ἐπιτρέπομεν ἑαυτοῖς ἢ ἑτέροις, ἢ λέξιν ἀμεῖψαι τῶν ἐγκειμένων ἐκεῖσε, ἢ μίαν γοῦν παραβῆναι συλλαβὴν, μεμνημένοι τοῦ λέγοντος Μὴ μέταιρε ὅρια αἰώνια ἃ ἔθεντο οἱ (Prov. xxii. 28.) πατέρες σου· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν αὐτοὶ οἱ λαλοῦντες, (Matt. x. 20.) ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός· ὃ ἐκπορεύεται μὲν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἔστι δὲ οὐκ ἀλλότριον (John xv. 26.) τοῦ Υἱοῦ κατά γε τὸν τῆς οὐσίας λόγον. καὶ πρός γε τοῦτο ἡμᾶς οἱ τῶν ἁγίων μυσταγωγῶν πιστοῦνται λόγοι. ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων γέγραπται Ἐλθόντες δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν (Acts xvi. 7.) ἐπείραζον εἰς τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορευθῆναι, καὶ οὐκ εἴασεν αὐτοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ· ἐπιστέλλει δὲ καὶ ὁ θεσπέσιος Παῦλος Οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες (Rom. viii. 8, 9.) Θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται, ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ.

Ὅταν δέ τινες τῶν τὰ ὀρθὰ διαστρέφειν εἰωθότων τὰς ἐμὰς παρατρέπωσι φωνὰς εἰς τὸ αὐτοῖς δοκοῦν, μὴ θαυμαζέτω τοῦτο ἡ σὴ ὁσιότης, εἰδυῖα ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ πάσης αἱρέσεως ἐκ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς τὰς τῆς ἑαυτῶν πλάνης συλλέγουσιν ἀφορμὰς, τὰ διὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ὀρθῶς εἰρημένα ταῖς ἑαυτῶν κακονοίαις παραφθείροντες, καὶ ταῖς ἰδίαις κεφαλαῖς τὴν ἄσβεστον ἐπαντλοῦντες φλόγα.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ μεμαθήκαμεν ὅτι καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν μακάριον Ἐπίκτητον ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ πανευφήμου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀθανασίου, ὀρθοδόξως ἔχουσαν, παραφθείραντές τινες ἐκδεδώκασιν, ὡς ἐντεῦθεν ἀδικεῖσθαι πολλούς, διὰ τοῦτο χρήσιμόν τι καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἐπινοοῦντες τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, ἐξ ἀντιγράφων ἀρχαίων τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἀπλανῶς ἐχόντων, ἀπεστείλαμεν τὰ ἴσα τῇ σῇ ὁσιότητι.

Ἐῤῥωμένον σε καὶ ὑπερευχόμενον ἡμῶν ὁ Κύριος διαφυλάξει, τιμιώτατε ἀδελφέ.

NOTES ON CYRIL'S LETTER TO JOHN OF ANTIOCH

11 *τῶν . . . βασιλέων.* Theodosius II. and Valentinian III.

52 *συγγραφή.* In its original form this document was the work of Theodoret, and it had apparently been exhibited to the Emperor in a shorter form during the conference at Chalcedon in September, 431.

56 *οὐκ ἐν προσθήκης μέρει,* "not by way of a supplement (to the Nicene Symbol)." *προσθεῖναι* is thus used by the bishops at Antioch in 341 at the end of their first creed, Socr. ii. 10, Athan. de synod. 22 (see their words cited, p. 48).

71 *ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί, κ.τ.λ.* This phrase finds a place again in the Chalcedonian Definition. The latter half, "co-essential with us as to Manhood," had occurred in Nestorius' Sermon 3, and had no doubt come into partial use before this as a "counter-statement to the doctrine of Apollinarius that Christ's Body was consubstantial to the Godhead." It was not, as yet, a well-known and accepted Catholic phrase; and this may explain Eutyches' subsequent hesitation respecting it (see below, pages 191, 207, 239). Comp. Vincent. Lerin. Common. 13 (written in 434), "In uno eodemque Christo duae substantiae sunt, ed una Divina altera humana . . . una consubstantialis

Patri, altera consubstantialis matri; unus tamen idemque Christus in utraque substantia."

91 *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ . . . σωμα Χριστοῦ.* This Apollinarian tenet had been ascribed to Cyril by Nestorius in his letter to Caelestine.

112 *Αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει, κ.τ.λ.* This is added from the Angel's words to Joseph, Matt. i. 21.

119 [*ὁ Κύριος*] *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.* The text is doubtful. The reference to it just below implies the omission of *ὁ Κύριος.* Cyril "apparently knew and used both readings" (Hort) of this verse. But in John iii. 13 next quoted he certainly omitted *ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ.*

127 *ἄτρεπτος γὰρ καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος.* This phrase, which Cyril had already used in his Third Letter to Nestorius, occurred both in the Creed of Alexandria and in that of Antioch, and was therefore naturally employed by the bishop of the one city writing to the bishop of the other. See above, pp. 59, 65.

132 *εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.* Here again Cyril cites the Creed, or perhaps directly from 1 Cor. viii. 6, as in Epist. ad Nest. 3.

135 *κρᾶσις ἢ σύγχυσις.* This again was laid to Cyril's charge as an Apollinarian error. His disclaimer is valuable as anticipating the condemnation of the Eutychian notion of the fusion or blending of the Two Natures. See below.

151 *οἰκονομικήν*, "oeconomic," *i.e.* "inherent in the Incarnation. *οἰκονομία* is constantly used by ecclesiastical

writers for the "Dispensation" whereby the Son of God manifested Himself in flesh, while *θεολογία* expressed the Divinity of His Person. Euseb. H.E. i. 1; Basil. Epist. 8. 3; Athan. Or. c. Ar. ii. 9, c. Apollin. i. 2, 18; Theodor. Dial. ii., *τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου καλοῦμεν οἰκονομίαν*: comp. *ib.* iii. *juxta fin.* Chalc. Def. 3. See Lightfoot's note on Ephes. i. 10 and on Ignat. Eph. 18 (ii. 75). Tertullian had used *θεολογία* in a different sense, of the relations of the Divine Persons in the Trinity (adv. Prax. 2, 3, 8).

157 *ταῖς τῶν ἁγ. π. δόξαις, κ.τ.λ.* Cyril no doubt had in mind the Fathers from whose writings extracts had been made in the Sixth Session of the Council of Ephesus, and appended to the Nicene Creed as a kind of Definition of Faith. They comprised passages from Peter of Alexandria, Athanasius' Orations and Epistle to Epictetus, Julius' Epistle to Docimus, Felix' Epistle to Maximus, the Paschal Letters of Theophilus of Alexandria, Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzum, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Atticus of Constantinople, and Amphilochius of Iconium. See Vincent. Common. 79, who omits the last two.

169 *ἢ μίαν γοῦν παραβῆναν συλλαβήν.* So Basil (Epist. 258) had written to Epiphanius in 377 "that 'not the smallest addition' could be made to the Nicene Creed except on the Divinity of the Holy Spirit" (Bright, Canons, p. 39).

192 *τὴν πρὸς τ. μ. Ἐπίκτητον ἐπιστολήν.* The letter dealt with two forms of Apollinarian error, and was often appealed to in later controversies.

APPENDIX

TO THE EPISTLES OF CYRIL

ANATHEMATISMS OF THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL AT CONSTANTINOPLE

A.D. 553

Mansi, ix. 367; Hahn, p. 168.

I. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος μίαν φύσιν ἤτοι οὐσίαν μίαν τε δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν, τριάδα ὁμοούσιον, μίαν θεότητα ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν ἤγουν προσώποις προσκυνουμένην· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Εἷς γὰρ Θεὸς καὶ Πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα.

II. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ, τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου εἶναι τὰς δύο γεννήσεις, τήν τε πρὸ αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός, ἀχρόνως καὶ ἀσωμάτως, τήν τε ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατελθόντος ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ σαρκωθέντος ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἐνδόξου θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας καὶ γεννηθέντος ἐξ αὐτῆς· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

III. Εἴ τις λέγει, ἄλλον εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον τὸν θαυματουργήσαντα καὶ ἄλλον τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν παθόντα, ἢ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον συνεῖναι λέγει τῷ Χριστῷ γενομένῳ ἐκ γυναικός, ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι ὡς ἄλλον ἐν ἄλλῳ, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τά τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ πάθη, ἅπερ ἑκουσίως ὑπέμεινε σαρκί· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

IV. Εἴ τις λέγει, κατὰ χάριν ἢ κατὰ ἐνέργειαν ἢ κατὰ ἰσοτιμίαν ἢ κατὰ αὐθεντίαν ἢ ἀναφορὰν ἢ σχέσιν ἢ δύναμιν

τὴν ἕνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου πρὸς ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι ἢ κατὰ εὐδοκίαν, ὡς ἀρεσθέντος τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀπὸ τοῦ εὖ καὶ καλῶς δόξαι αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ, καθὼς Θεόδωρος μαινόμενος λέγει, ἢ κατὰ ὁμωνυμίαν, καθ' ἣν οἱ Νεστοριανοὶ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον Ἰησοῦν καὶ Χριστὸν καλοῦντες, καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον κεχωρισμένως Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ὀνομάζοντες, καὶ δύο πρόσωπα προφανῶς λέγοντες κατὰ μόνην τὴν προσηγορίαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀξίαν καὶ προσκύνησιν, καὶ ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ ἕνα Χριστὸν ὑποκρίνονται λέγειν· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὴν ἕνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου πρὸς σάρκα ἐμψυχωμένην ψυχῇ λογικῇ καὶ νοερᾷ κατὰ σύνθεσιν ἤγουν καθ' ὑπόστασιν γεγενῆσθαι, καθὼς οἱ ἅγιοι πατέρες ἐδίδαξαν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν, ὅ ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, εἷς τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Πολυτρόπως γὰρ νοουμένης τῆς ἑνώσεως οἱ μὲν τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ Ἀπολιναρίου καὶ Εὐτυχοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντος τῷ ἀφανισμῷ τῶν συνελθόντων προκείμενοι, τὴν κατὰ σύγχυσιν τὴν ἕνωσιν πρεσβεύουσιν· οἱ δὲ τὰ Θεοδώρου καὶ Νεστορίου φρονοῦντες τῇ διαιρέσει χαίροντες σχετικὴν τὴν ἕνωσιν ἐπεισάγουσιν. Ἡ μέντοι ἁγία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία, ἑκατέρας αἱρέσεως τὴν ἀσέβειαν ἀποβαλλομένη, τὴν ἕνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου πρὸς τὴν σάρκα κατὰ σύνθεσιν ὁμολογεῖ, ὅπερ ἐστὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν. Ἡ γὰρ κατὰ σύνθεσιν ἕνωσις ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν μυστηρίου οὐ μόνον ἀσύγχυτα τὰ συνελθόντα διαφυλάττει, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ διαίρεσιν ἐπιδέχεται.

V. Εἴ τις τὴν μίαν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οὕτως ἐκλαμβάνει, ὡς ἐπιδεχομένην πολλῶν ὑποστάσεων σημασίαν, καὶ διὰ τούτου εἰσάγειν ἐπιχειρεῖ ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν μυστηρίου δύο ὑποστάσεις ἤτοι δύο πρόσωπα, καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰσαγομένων δύο προσώπων ἓν πρόσωπον λέγει κατὰ ἀξίαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ προσκύνησιν, καθάπερ Θεόδωρος καὶ Νεστόριος μαινόμενοι συνεγράψαντο· καὶ συκοφαντεῖ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον

ὡς κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀσεβῆ ἔννοιαν χρησαμένην τῷ τῆς μιᾶς ὑποστάσεως ῥήματι, ἀλλὰ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον σαρκὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑνωθῆναι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἤτοι ἓν πρόσωπον, οὕτως τε καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον μίαν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμολογῆσαι· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Οὔτε γὰρ προσθήκην προσώπου ἤγουν ὑποστάσεως ἐπεδέξατο ἡ ἁγία τριὰς καὶ σαρκωθέντος τοῦ ἑνὸς τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος, Θεοῦ Λόγου.

VI. Εἴ τις καταχρηστικῶς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθῶς, θεοτόκον λέγει τὴν ἁγίαν ἔνδοξον ἀειπαρθένον Μαρίαν ἢ κατὰ ἀναφοράν, ὡς ἀνθρώπου ψιλοῦ γεννηθέντος, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σαρκωθέντος [καὶ τῆς] ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἀναφερομένης δὲ κατ' ἐκείνου τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου γεννήσεως ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον, ὡς συνόντα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ γενομένῳ· καὶ συκοφαντεῖ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον, ὡς κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀσεβῆ ἐπινοηθεῖσαν παρὰ Θεοδώρου ἔννοιαν θεοτόκον τὴν παρθένον εἰποῦσαν· ἢ εἴ τις ἀνθρωποτόκον αὐτὴν καλεῖ ἢ χριστοτόκον, ὡς τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ ὄντος Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ μὴ κυρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν θεοτόκον αὐτὴν ὁμολογεῖ, διὰ τὸ τὸν πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα Θεὸν Λόγον ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς σαρκωθῆναι, οὕτω τε εὐσεβῶς καὶ τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι σύνοδον θεοτόκον αὐτὴν ὁμολογῆσαι· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

VII. Εἴ τις ἐν δύο φύσεσι λέγων μὴ ὡς ἐν θεότητι καὶ ἀνθρωπότητι τὸν ἕνα Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν γνωρίζεσθαι ὁμολογεῖ, ἵνα διὰ τούτου σημάνῃ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν φύσεων, ἐξ ὧν ἀσυγχύτως ἡ ἄφραστος ἕνωσις γέγονεν, οὔτε τοῦ Λόγου εἰς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς μεταποιηθέντος φύσιν οὔτε τῆς σαρκὸς πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Λόγου φύσιν μεταχωρησάσης,—μένει γὰρ ἑκάτερον ὅπερ ἐστὶ τῇ φύσει, καὶ γενομένης τῆς ἑνώσεως καθ' ὑπόστασιν,—ἀλλ' ἐπὶ διαιρέσει τῇ ἀνὰ μέρος τὴν τοιαύτην λαμβάνει φωνὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν

μυστηρίου ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν φύσεων ὁμολογῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἑνὸς Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου σαρκωθέντος, μὴ τῇ θεωρίᾳ μόνῃ τὴν διαφορὰν τούτων λαμβάνει, ἐξ ὧν καὶ συνετέθη, οὐκ ἀναιρουμένην διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν,—εἷς γὰρ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν καὶ δι' ἑνὸς ἀμφότερα—ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ κέχρηται τῷ ἀριθμῷ ὡς κεχωρισμένας καὶ ἰδιοϋποστάτους ἔχει τὰς φύσεις· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

VIII. Εἴ τις ἐκ δύο φύσεων, θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος ὁμολογῶν τὴν ἕνωσιν γεγενῆσθαι, ἢ μίαν φύσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένην λέγων, μὴ οὕτως αὐτὰ λαμβάνῃ, καθάπερ καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι πατέρες ἐδίδαξαν, ὅτι ἐκ τῆς θείας φύσεως καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης, τῆς ἑνώσεως καθ' ὑπόστασιν γενομένης, εἷς Χριστὸς ἀπετελέσθη, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων φωνῶν μίαν φύσιν ἤτοι οὐσίαν θεότητος καὶ σαρκὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰσάγειν ἐπιχειρεῖ· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Καθ' ὑπόστασιν γὰρ λέγοντες τὸν μονογενῆ Λόγον ἡνῶσθαι οὐκ ἀνάχυσίν τινα τὴν εἰς ἀλλήλους τῶν φύσεων πεπρᾶχθαί φαμεν, μενούσης δὲ μᾶλλον ἑκατέρας ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡνῶσθαι σαρκὶ νοοῦμεν τὸν Λόγον. Διὸ καὶ εἷς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ὁ αὐτὸς ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν ὁ αὐτὸς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. Ἐπίσης γὰρ καὶ τοὺς ἀνὰ μέρος διαιροῦντας ἤτοι τέμνοντας καὶ τοὺς συγχέοντας τὸ τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀποστρέφεται καὶ ἀναθεματίζει ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία.

IX. Εἴ τις προσκυνεῖσθαι ἐν δυσὶ φύσεσι λέγει τὸν Χριστόν, ἐξ οὗ δύο προσκυνήσεις εἰσάγονται, ἰδία τῷ Θεῷ Λόγῳ καὶ ἰδία τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· ἢ εἴ τις ἐπὶ ἀναιρέσει τῆς σαρκὸς ἢ ἐπὶ συγχύσει τῆς θεότητος καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ἢ μίαν φύσιν ἤγουν οὐσίαν τῶν συνελθόντων τερατευόμενος, οὕτω προσκυνεῖ τὸν Χριστόν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ μιᾷ προσκυνήσει τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον σαρκωθέντα μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς

προσκυνεῖ, καθάπερ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία παρέλαβεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

X. Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ, τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκὶ Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν εἶναι Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ Κύριον τῆς δόξης καὶ ἕνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

XI. Εἴ τις μὴ ἀναθεματίζει Ἄρειον, Εὐνόμιον, Μακεδόνιον, Ἀπολινάριον, Νεστόριον, Εὐτυχέα καὶ Ὠριγένην μετὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτῶν συγγραμμάτων, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας αἱρετικοὺς τοὺς κατακριθέντας καὶ ἀναθεματισθέντας ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν προειρημένων ἁγίων τεσσάρων συνόδων, καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια τῶν προειρημένων αἱρετικῶν φρονήσαντας ἢ φρονοῦντας καὶ μέχρι τέλους τῇ οἰκείᾳ ἀσεβείᾳ ἐμμείναντας· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

XII. Εἴ τις ἀντιποιεῖται Θεοδώρου τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς, τοῦ Μοψουεστίας, τοῦ εἰπόντος, ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον καὶ ἄλλον τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὸ παθῶν ψυχῆς καὶ τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐνοχλούμενον καὶ τῶν χειρόνων κατὰ μικρὸν χωριζόμενον, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ προκοπῆς ἔργων βελτιωθέντα καὶ ἐκ πολιτείας ἄμωμον καταστάντα, ὡς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον βαπτισθῆναι εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, καὶ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὴν χάριν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος λαβεῖν, καὶ υἱοθεσίας ἀξιωθῆναι, καὶ κατ' ἰσότητα βασιλικῆς εἰκόνος εἰς πρόσωπον τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου προσκυνεῖσθαι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἄτρεπτον ταῖς ἐννοίαις καὶ ἀναμάρτητον παντελῶς γενέσθαι· καὶ πάλιν εἰρηκότος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβοῦς Θεοδώρου, τὴν ἕνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν τοιαύτην γεγενῆσθαι, οἵαν ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπὶ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικός· ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· καὶ πρὸς ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀναριθμήτοις αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαις τολμήσαντος εἰπεῖν, ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐμφυσήσας ὁ Κύριος τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ εἰπών· Λάβετε

Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, οὐ δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, ἀλλὰ σχήματι μόνον ἐνεφύσησεν· οὗτος δὲ καὶ τὴν ὁμολογίαν Θωμᾶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ψηλαφήσει τῶν χειρῶν καὶ τῆς πλευρᾶς τοῦ Κυρίου μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, τό· Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου, εἶπε, μὴ εἰρῆσθαι περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Θωμᾶ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐκπλαγέντα τὸν Θωμᾶν ὑμνῆσαι τὸν Θεόν, τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν Χριστόν· τὸ δὲ χεῖρον, καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων γενομένῃ παρ' αὐτοῦ δῆθεν ἑρμηνείᾳ συγκρίνων ὁ αὐτὸς Θεόδωρος τὸν Χριστὸν Πλάτωνι καὶ Μανιχαίῳ καὶ Ἐπικούρῳ καὶ Μαρκίωνι λέγει, ὅτι, ὥσπερ ἐκείνων ἕκαστος εὑράμενος οἰκεῖον δόγμα τοὺς αὐτῷ μαθητεύσαντας πεποίηκε καλεῖσθαι Πλατωνικοὺς καὶ Μανιχαίους καὶ Ἐπικουρείους καὶ Μαρκιωνιστάς, τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ εὑραμένου δόγμα ἐξ αὐτοῦ Χριστιανοὺς καλεῖσθαι· εἴ τις τοίνυν ἀντιποιεῖται τοῦ εἰρημένου ἀσεβεστάτου Θεοδώρου καὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, ἐν οἷς τάς τε εἰρημένας καὶ ἄλλας ἀναριθμήτους βλασφημίας ἐξέχεε κατὰ τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀναθεματίζει αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ ἀσεβῆ αὐτοῦ συγγράμματα καὶ πάντας τοὺς δεχομένους ἢ καὶ ἐκδικοῦντας αὐτὸν ἢ λέγοντας, ὀρθοδόξως αὐτὸν ἐκθέσθαι, καὶ τοὺς γράψαντας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων, καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια φρονοῦντας ἢ φρονήσαντας πώποτε καὶ μέχρι τέλους ἐμμείναντας τῇ τοιαύτῃ αἱρέσει· ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

XIII. Εἴ τις ἀντιποιεῖται τῶν ἀσεβῶν συγγραμμάτων Θεοδωρίτου, τῶν κατὰ τῆς ἀληθοῦς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρώτης καὶ ἁγίας συνόδου καὶ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Κυρίλλου καὶ τῶν δώδεκα αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίων, καὶ πάντων ὧν συνεγράψατο ὑπὲρ Θεοδώρου καὶ Νεστορίου, τῶν δυσσεβῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄλλων τῶν τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς προειρημένοις Θεοδώρῳ καὶ Νεστορίῳ φρονούντων καὶ δεχομένων αὐτοὺς καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ἀσέβειαν, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ἀσεβεῖς καλεῖ τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας

διδασκάλους, τοὺς καθ' ὑπόστασιν τὴν ἕνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου φρονοῦντας· καὶ εἴπερ οὐκ ἀναθεματίζει τὰ εἰρημένα ἀσεβῆ συγγράμματα καὶ τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις φρονήσαντας ἢ φρονοῦντας, καὶ πάντας δὲ τοὺς γράψαντας κατὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως ἢ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Κυρίλλου καὶ τῶν δώδεκα αὐτοῦ κεφαλαίων, καὶ ἐν τοιαύτῃ ἀσεβείᾳ τελευτήσαντας· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

XIV. Εἴ τις ἀντιποιεῖται τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς λεγομένης παρὰ Ἴβα γεγράφθαι πρὸς Μάρην τὸν Πέρσην, τῆς ἀρνουμένης μὲν τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας σαρκωθέντα ἄνθρωπον γεγενῆσθαι, λεγούσης δὲ ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ αὐτῆς γεννηθῆναι, ὃν ναὸν ἀποκαλεῖ, ὡς ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον καὶ ἄλλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον· καὶ τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Κύριλλον τὴν ὀρθὴν τῶν χριστιανῶν πίστιν κηρύξαντα διαβαλλούσης ὡς αἱρετικὸν καὶ ὁμοίως Ἀπολιναρίῳ τῷ δυσσεβεῖ γράψαντα· καὶ μεμφομένης τὴν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ πρώτην ἁγίαν σύνοδον, ὡς χωρὶς κρίσεως καὶ ζητήσεως Νεστόριον καθελοῦσαν· καὶ τὰ δώδεκα κεφάλαια τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Κυρίλλου ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἐναντία τῇ ὀρθῇ πίστει ἀποκαλεῖ ἡ αὐτὴ ἀσεβὴς ἐπιστολή, καὶ ἐκδικεῖ Θεόδωρον καὶ Νεστόριον καὶ τὰ ἀσεβῆ αὐτῶν δόγματα καὶ συγγράμματα· εἴ τις τοίνυν τῆς εἰρημένης ἐπιστολῆς ἀντιποιεῖται, καὶ μὴ ἀναθεματίζει αὐτὴν καὶ τοὺς ἀντιποιουμένους αὐτῆς, καὶ λέγοντας αὐτὴν ὀρθὴν εἶναι ἢ μέρος αὐτῆς, καὶ γράψαντας καὶ γράφοντας ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἢ τῶν περιεχομένων αὐτῇ ἀσεβειῶν, καὶ τολμῶντας ταύτην ἐκδικεῖν ἢ τὰς περιεχομένας αὐτῇ ἀσεβείας ὀνόματι τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἢ τῆς ἁγίας ἐν Χαλκηδόνι συνόδου, καὶ τούτοις μέχρι τέλους ἐμμείναντας· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

THE TOME OF LEO

ΠΑΣΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΥ
ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΦΩΝΗΣ ἙΡΜΗΝΕΥΣ

THE TOME OF LEO

INTRODUCTION

The circumstances under which the Tome was written were these.

Eutyches was the archimandrite of some three hundred monks in a large monastery near Constantinople. In 431 he had joined the long train of anti-Nestorian abbats and monks, whose representations to the Emperor Theodosius had led to the release of Cyril and to the imperial acceptance of Nestorius' deposition. He was now an old man of seventy, and his life had been passed in the seclusion of his monastery. An unfortunate obstinacy of mind, united with an incapacity for holding the balance of theological truth,* led him, in his zealous opposition to Nestorianism, to deny the reality of the Human Nature in Christ. On this ground a charge was brought against him by a former intimate friend, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, in a synod which happened to be sitting at Constantinople on November 8, 448, under the presidency

* So Leo speaks of him as "multum imprudens et nimis imperitus"; and again (Epist. 29) as erring "imperite atque imprudenter"; and still more strongly (Epist. 33 ad Synod. Ephes.) as "ostendere se nullum unquam studium cognoscendae veritatis habuisse, et superfluo honorabilem visum, qui nulla maturitate cordis ornavit canitiem senectutis" (comp. too Epist. 38 ad Flav.).

of the Archbishop Flavian.* So high was the estimation in which Eutyches was held that it was only with the greatest reluctance that Flavian consented to hear the formal charge of heresy, and to summon the archimandrite to make his defence. The synod adjourned, but it was not until the seventh session, on November 22, that Eutyches appeared, accompanied by soldiers and monks and an imperial commissioner. Confronted with the teaching of Cyril in his Letter to John, on the distinction of the Two Natures in Christ, Eutyches admitted a "Union out of Two Natures" (*ἕνωσις ἐκ δύο φύσεων*), but declined to acknowledge the existence of Two Natures after the Incarnation, and wished to put in a written statement of his own. This, however, he appeared unwilling to read out,† but said that he confessed Christ as Perfect Man from the flesh of the Virgin.‡ In deference to the synod he further admitted, though reluctantly, that

* There was always a large number of Bishops staying in Constantinople on business connected with their own churches. These "could easily be collected by a message from the Archbishop," and this *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* "became a recognized part of the ecclesiastical machinery, and as time ran on gained a prescriptive authority" (note in Oxf. trans. of Fleury, iii. 406). It was not a permanent assembly, but an irregular convocation, which was found very useful for the despatch of the business of the Patriarchate. Its practical usefulness is illustrated by the words of Anatolius in the Fourth Session of the Council of Chalcedon (Mansi, vii. 92), "A custom has long prevailed that Bishops who are staying (*ἐνδημοῦντας*) in Constantinople should assemble when occasion requires for such ecclesiastical affairs as accidentally occur." Its existence undoubtedly had aided largely in establishing the Patriarchal jurisdiction of Constantinople, which was confirmed, in spite of the Roman protest, by Chalc. canon 28.

† He appended it to his letter to Leo (apud Leon. Epist. 21), but it has not been preserved.

‡ "I adore the Father with the Son, and the Son with the Father, and the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son. I confess that His Incarnate Presence came from the flesh of the holy Virgin, and that He was made Perfect Man for our salvation."

Christ was co-essential with us as to His Manhood,* and repeatedly said that he did not wish to speculate upon the Nature (φυσιολογεῖν) of One who was his God. Much reasoning and argument were expended, and when the discussion finally narrowed down to the question, "Do you confess Two Natures after the Union?" Eutyches' reply in the negative, from which nothing could move him, left no room for doubt as to his heresy.† Only one course was open, and in all sorrow Flavian, in the name of the synod, pronounced sentence of excommunication and deposition on the archimandrite and any who should adhere to him. Eutyches intimated to the commissioner Florentius his intention of appealing to Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, and wrote to Pope Leo complaining of ill-treatment, and anathematizing Apollinarius, Valentinus, Manes, Nestorius, and all heresies. Flavian also wrote to inform Leo of the facts of the case, but his letter met with some delay in transit, for on February 18, 449, Leo, who had surmised from Eutyches' letter and from another which he had received from the Emperor that Flavian had acted with some want of charity, wrote to Flavian expressing his surprise that he had not been informed of the case (Epist. 23). Flavian's original letter, with the acts of the synod, arrived later, and was acknowledged on May 21st. His second letter, in response

* See note above on Form. of Reunion, p. 173; and below on the Tome, p. 207, and again on Chalc. Def., p. 239. The admission was evidently so reluctant that it failed to convey the impression of sincerity, for Flavian twice asserted that Eutyches did not admit the Human co-essentiality (Epist. 22 and 26 in the Leonine collection).

† From evidence subsequently given by Basil of Seleucia it appeared that Eutyches had said that he would agree to abide by the ruling of the Bishops of Rome and of Alexandria on the point, implying that he did not believe that they would admit the Two Natures.

to Leo's of February 18, did not reach Rome until near the end of June, after Leo had written the Tome (Epist. 26, 36). Meanwhile Theodosius, in response to the desire of Dioscorus of Alexandria, who had become a zealous partizan of Eutyches, had written on March 30 summoning a General Council to meet at Ephesus on August 1st.

Eutyches possessed a good deal of court influence, and by the Emperor's orders a preliminary synod sat at Constantinople on April 8th to revise the acts of the "Home Synod," which Eutyches asserted were inaccurate, but which were confirmed in all essential particulars. Another petition was presented to the Emperor by Eutyches, and a second court of review was instituted on April 27, where it was pretended that Eutyches had been condemned before his trial, and that the acts of the Council had been falsified. Flavian's confession of faith was demanded and produced. He adhered to Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus, and acknowledged in Christ after the Incarnation Two Natures *ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει καὶ ἐν ἑνὶ προσώπῳ*, and would admit (in Cyrilline language) One Nature of the Divine Word Incarnate and made Man.

The Emperor nominated Dioscorus as President of the coming Council, and invited the Western Bishops and Pope Leo. The latter saw no necessity for a Council, and would have preferred it to have been held, if at all, in Italy. He nominated three legates to represent him at Ephesus: Julius, Bishop of Puteoli; Renatus, a priest; and Hilarus, a deacon.

On June 13, 449, amongst other letters, he wrote, as a fuller answer to Flavian's first letter, the celebrated Tome, which as a doctrinal formulary was subsequently accepted at Chalcedon, and declared authoritative on the subject of the mystery of the Incarnation.

ANALYSIS OF LEO'S TOME

A. *Introductory.* § 1. Eutyches has fallen into error through ignorance and theological incompetency.

B. *Doctrinal.* § 2. He should have studied the Creed, St. Matthew and St. Paul, and Old Testament prophecies, which teach the reality of the Incarnation.

§ 3. Two Natures without confusion met in One Person.

§ 4. The Son of God is born after a new order—in time, and by a new mode of birth—from a Virgin; yet with Flesh like ours, only faultless. The Selfsame is Very God and Very Man, each Nature working in its own sphere.

§ 5. The *communicatio idiomatum.* The properties of each Nature, while remaining distinct, are yet referable to the One Person of the Son of God. Eutyches has rejected this truth, and "dissolved" Jesus by denying His Human Nature, and by holding Docetic views of His Body and His Passion.

	§ 6. Eutyches' confession — "of two natures before the union"—is as impious as his denial of the Two Natures after the Incarnation.
C. *Hortatory.*	Endeavour to reclaim him, and if he repents and condemns these errors in writing, restore him.
D. *Conclusion.*	For the due execution of the matter we are sending three legates to the Council.

THE TOME OF LEO

DILECTISSIMO FRATRI FLAVIANO LEO

I. Lectis dilectionis tuae litteris, quas miramur fuisse tam seras, et gestorum episcopalium ordine recensito, tandem quid apud vos scandali contra integritatem fidei exortum fuisset, agnovimus; et quae prius videbantur occulta, nunc nobis reserata patuerunt. Quibus Eutyches, qui presbyterii nomine honorabilis videbatur, multum imprudens et nimis imperitus ostenditur, ut etiam de ipso dictum sit a propheta: *Noluit intelligere, ut bene* Ps. xxxv. 4. *ageret, iniquitatem meditatus est in cubili suo.* Quid autem iniquius, quam impia sapere, et sapientioribus doctioribusque non cedere? Sed in hanc insipientiam cadunt, qui cum ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro, non ad propheticas voces, non ad apostolicas litteras nec ad evangelicas auctoritates, sed ad semetipsos recurrunt; et ideo magistri erroris exsistunt, quia veritatis discipuli non fuere. Quam enim eruditionem de sacris novi et veteris testamenti paginis acquisivit, qui ne ipsius quidem Symboli initia comprehendit? Et quod per totum mundum omnium regenerandorum voce depromitur, istius adhuc senis corde non capitur.

II. Nesciens igitur, quid deberet de Verbi Dei incarnatione sentire, nec volens ad promerendum intelligentiae lumen in sanctarum scripturarum latitudine laborare illam saltem communem et indiscretam confessionem sollicito recepisset auditu, qua fidelium universitas pro-

Rom. Symb. fitetur: *Credere se in Deum Patrem omnipotentem et in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu sancto et Maria virgine.* Quibus tribus sententiis omnium fere haereticorum machinae destruuntur. Cum enim Deus et omnipotens et Pater creditur, consempiternus eidem Filius demon- Nic. Symb. stratur, in nullo a Patre differens, quia *de Deo Deus,* de omnipotente omnipotens, de aeterno natus est coaeternus, non posterior tempore, non inferior potestate, non dissimilis gloria, non divisus essentia; idem vero sempiterni genitoris unigenitus sempiternus natus est de Spiritu sancto et Maria virgine. Quae nativitas temporalis illi nativitati divinae et sempiternae nihil minuit, nihil contulit, sed totam se reparando homini, qui erat deceptus, impendit, ut et mortem vinceret et diabolum, qui mortis habebat imperium, sua virtute destrueret. Non enim superare possemus peccati et mortis auctorem, nisi naturam nostram ille susciperet et suam faceret, quem nec peccatum contaminare nec mors potuit detinere. Conceptus quippe est de Spiritu sancto intra uterum matris virginis, quae illum ita salva virginitate edidit, quemadmodum salva virginitate concepit.

Sed si de hoc christianae fidei fonte purissimo sincerum intellectum haurire non poterat, quia splendorem perspicuae veritatis obcaecatione sibi propria tenebrarat; doctrinae se evangelicae subdidisset. Et dicente Matthaeo: Matt. i. 1. *Liber generationis Jesu Christi filii David, filii Abraham,* apostolicae quoque praedicationis expetisset instructum. Et legens in epistola ad Romanos: *Paulus,* Rom. i. 1 ff. *servus Jesu Christi, vocatus apostolus, segregatus in evangelium Dei, quod ante promiserat per prophetas suos in scripturis sanctis de Filio suo, qui factus est Ei ex semine David secundum carnem,* ad propheticas paginas piam

sollicitudinem contulisset. Et inveniens promissionem Dei ad Abraham dicentis: *In semine tuo benedicentur omnes gentes*, Gen. xii. 3, xxii. 18. ne de hujus seminis proprietate dubitaret, secutus fuisset apostolum dicentem: *Abrahae dictae sunt promissiones et semini ejus.* Gal. iii. 16. *Non dicit: et seminibus, quasi in multis, sed quasi in uno: et semini tuo, quod est Christus.* Isaiae quoque praedicationem interiore apprehendisset auditu dicentis: *Ecce virgo in utero accipiet et pariet filium, et vocabunt nomen ejus Immanuel, quod est interpretatum: nobiscum Deum.* Isaiah vii. 14. Matt. i 23. Ejusdem prophetae fideliter verba legisset: *Puer natus est nobis, filius datus est nobis, cujus potestas super humerum ejus, et vocabunt nomen ejus: Magni Consilii Angelus, Admirabilis Consiliarius, Deus fortis, Princeps pacis, Pater futuri saeculi.* Isaiah ix. 6. Nec frustratorie loquens ita Verbum diceret carnem factum, ut editus utero virginis Christus haberet formam hominis et non haberet materni corporis veritatem. An forte ideo putavit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum non nostrae esse naturae, quia missus ad beatam Mariam semper virginem angelus ait: *Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te, et virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi; ideoque et quod nascetur ex te sanctum vocabitur Filius Dei?* Luc. i. 35. ut, quia conceptus virginis divini fuit operis, non de natura concipientis fuerit caro concepti. Sed non ita intelligenda est illa generatio singulariter mirabilis et mirabiliter singularis, ut per novitatem creationis proprietas remota sit generis. Fecunditatem enim virgini Spiritus sanctus dedit, veritas autem corporis sumta de corpore est; et *aedificante sibi sapientia domum:* Prov. ix. 1. *Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis*, Ioan. i. 14. hoc est in ea carne, quam assumsit ex homine, et quam spiritu vitae rationalis animavit.

III. Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae, et in unam coëunte personam, suscepta est a majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab aeternitate mortalitas; et ad resolvendum conditionis nostrae debitum natura inviolabilis naturae est unita passibili, ut, quod nostris remediis congruebat, unus atque idem mediator Dei et hominum, homo Jesus Christus, et mori posset ex uno et mori non posset ex altero. In integra ergo veri hominis perfectaque natura versus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris. "Nostra" autem dicimus, quae in nobis ab initio Creator condidit et quae reparanda suscepit. Nam illa, quae deceptor intulit et homo deceptus admisit, nullum habuerunt in Salvatore vestigium. Nec quia communionem humanarum subiit infirmitatum, ideo nostrorum fuit particeps delictorum. Assumpsit formam servi sine sorde peccati, humana augens, divina non minuens; quia exinanitio illa, qua se invisibilis visibilem praebuit, et creator ac Dominus omnium rerum unus voluit esse mortalium, inclinatio fuit miserationis, non defectio potestatis. Proinde qui manens in forma Dei fecit hominem, idem in forma servi factus est homo. Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura; et sicut formam servi Dei forma non adimit, ita formam Dei servi forma non minuit. Nam quia gloriabatur diabolus, hominem sua fraude deceptum divinis caruisse muneribus, et immortalitatis dote nudatum duram mortis subiisse sententiam, seque in malis suis quoddam de praevaricatoris consortio invenisse solatium; Deum quoque, justitiae exigente ratione, erga hominem, quem in tanto honore condiderat, propriam mutasse sententiam; opus fuit secreti dispensatione consilii, ut incommutabilis Deus, cujus voluntas non potest sua benignitate privari, primam erga nos pietatis suae dispositionem sacramento occultiore

compleret, et homo diabolicae iniquitatis versutia actus in culpam contra Dei propositum non periret.

IV. Ingreditur ergo haec mundi infima Filius Dei, de caelesti sede descendens et a paterna gloria non recedens, novo ordine, nova nativitate generatus. Novo ordine, quia invisibilis in suis visibilis factus est in nostris, incomprehensibilis voluit comprehendi; ante tempora manens esse coepit ex tempore; universitatis Dominus servilem formam obumbrata majestatis suae immensitate suscepit; impassibilis Deus non dedignatus est homo esse passibilis, et immortalis mortis legibus subjacere. Nova autem nativitate generatus, quia inviolata virginitas concupiscentiam nescivit, carnis materiam ministravit. Assumpta est de matre Domini natura, non culpa; nec in Domino Jesu Christo ex utero virginis genito, quia nativitas est mirabilis, ideo nostri est natura dissimilis. Qui enim verus est Deus, idem verus est homo; et nullum est in hac unitate mendacium, dum invicem sunt et humilitas et altitudo deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non mutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate. Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod propriun est; Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud succumbit injuriis. Et sicut Verbum ab aequalitate paternae gloriae non recedit, ita caro naturam nostri generis non relinquit. Unus enim idemque est, quod saepe dicendum est, vere Dei Filius et vere hominis Filius. Deus per id quod
in principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Ioan. i. 1.
Deum, et Deus erat Verbum; homo per id quod *Verbum*
caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis. Deus per ib. 14.
id quod *omnia per ipsum facta sunt, et sine ipso* ib. 8.
factum est nihil; homo per id quod *factus est* Gal iv. 4.

ex muliere, factus sub lege. Nativitas carnis manifestatio est humanae naturae; partus virginis divinae est virtutis indicium. Infantia parvuli ostenditur humilitate cunarum; magnitudo Altissimi declaratur vocibus angelorum. Similis est rudimentis hominum, quem Herodes impie molitur occidere; sed Dominus est omnium, quem Magi gaudent suppliciter adorare. Iam cum ad praecursoris sui Joannis baptismum venit, ne lateret, quod carnis velamine divinitas tegeretur, vox Patris de caelo intonans Matt. iii. 17. dixit: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi bene complacui.* Quem itaque sicut hominem diabolica tentat astutia, eidem sicut Deo angelica famulantur officia. Esurire, sitire, lassescere atque dormire evidenter humanum est. Sed quinque panibus millia hominum satiare et largiri Samaritanae aquam vivam, cujus haustus bibenti praestet, ne ultra jam sitiat; supra dorsum maris Cf. Ps. xcii. 3 f. plantis non desidentibus ambulare, et *elationes fluctuum* increpata tempestate consternere, sine ambiguitate divinum est. Sicut ergo, ut multa praeteream, non ejusdem naturae est flere miserationis affectu amicum mortuum, et eundem remoto quatriduanae aggere sepulturae ad vocis imperium excitare redivivum; aut in ligno pendere, et in noctem luce conversa omnia elementa tremefacere; aut clavis transfixum esse, et paradisi portas fidei latronis aperire; ita non ejusdem naturae est dicere: Ioan. x. 30; *Ego et Pater unum sumus,* et dicere: *Pater* xiv. 28. *major Me est.* Quamvis enim in Domino Jesu Christo Dei et hominis una persona sit, aliud tamen est unde in utroque communis est contumelia, aliud unde communis est gloria. De nostro enim illi est minor Patre humanitas; de Patre illi est aequalis cum Patre divinitas.

V. Propter hanc ergo unitatem personae in utraque

natura intelligendam et Filius hominis legitur descendisse de caelo, cum Filius Dei carnem de ea virgine, de qua est natus, assumpserit, et rursus Filius Dei crucifixus dicitur ac sepultus, cum haec non in divinitate ipsa, qua Unigenitus consempiternus et consubstantialis est Patri, sed in naturae humanae sit infirmitate perpessus. Unde unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum et sepultum omnes etiam in Symbolo confitemur secundum illud apostoli: *Si enim cognovissent, numquam Dominum majestatis* 1 Cor. ii. 8. *crucifixissent.* Cum autem ipse Dominus noster atque Salvator fidem discipulorum suis interrogationibus erudiret, *Quem me*, inquit, *dicunt homines esse* Matt. xvi. 13 ff. *Filium hominis?* Cumque illi diversas aliorum opiniones retexuissent, *Vos autem*, ait, *quem me esse dicitis?* Me utique, qui sum Filius hominis, et quem in forma servi atque in veritate carnis aspicitis, quem me esse dicitis? Ubi beatus Petrus divinitus inspiratus et confessione sua omnibus gentibus profuturus *Tu es*, inquit, *Christus Filius Dei vivi.* Nec immerito beatus est pronuntiatus a Domino et a principali petra soliditatem et virtutis traxit et nominis, qui per revelationem Patris eundem et Dei Filium est confessus et Christum, quia unum horum sine alio receptum non proderat ad salutem; et aequalis erat periculi Dominum Jesum Christum aut Deum tantummodo sine homine aut sine Deo solum hominem credidisse. Post resurrectionem vero Domini (quae utique veri corporis fuit, quia non alter est resuscitatus, quam qui fuerat crucifixus et mortuus) quid aliud quadraginta dierum mora gestum est, quam ut fidei nostrae integritas ab omni caligine mundaretur? Colloquens enim cum discipulis suis et cohabitans atque convescens et pertractari se diligenti curiosoque contactu ab eis, quos dubietas perstringebat, admittens, ideo et clausis

ad discipulos januis introibat, et flatu suo dabat Spiritum
sanctum, et donato intelligentiae lumine sanctarum Scrip-
turarum occulta pandebat; et rursus idem vulnus lateris,
fixuras clavorum et omnia recentissimae passionis signa
Luc. xxiv. 39. monstrabat dicens: *Videte manus meas et pedes
quia ego sum. Palpate et videte, quia spiritus carnem et
ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habere;* ut agnosceretur in
eo proprietas divinae humanaeque naturae individua per-
manere; et ita sciremus, Verbum non hoc esse quod
carnem, ut unum Dei Filium et Verbum confiteremur et
carnem. Quo fidei sacramento Eutyches iste nimium aesti-
mandus est vacuus, qui naturam nostram in Unigenito
Dei nec per humilitatem mortalitatis nec per gloriam
resurrectionis agnovit. Nec sententiam beati apostoli et
1 Ioan. iv. 2 f. evangelistae Joannis expavit dicentis: *Omnis
spiritus, qui confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse, ex
Deo est; et omnis spiritus, qui solvit Jesum, ex Deo non est;
et hic est Antichristus.* Quid autem est solvere Jesum,
nisi humanam ab eo separare naturam, et sacramentum,
per quod unum salvati sumus, impudentissimis evacuare
figmentis? Caligans vero circa naturam corporis Christi
necesse est, ut etiam in passione ejus eadem obcaecatione
desipiat. Nam si crucem Domini non putat falsam, et
susceptum pro mundi salute supplicium verum fuisse non
dubitat; cujus credit mortem, agnoscat et carnem; nec
diffiteatur nostri corporis hominem, quem cognoscit fuisse
passibilem, quoniam negatio verae carnis negatio est etiam
corporeae passionis. Si ergo christianam suscipit fidem et
a praedicatione evangelii suum non avertit auditum, videat,
quae natura transfixa clavis pependerit in crucis ligno, et
aperto per militis lanceam latere crucifixi intelligat,
Ioan. xix. 34. unde *sanguis et aqua* fluxerit, ut ecclesia Dei
et lavacro rigaretur et poculo. Audiat et beatum Petrum

apostolum praedicantem, quod sanctificatio Spiritus per aspersionem fiat sanguinis Christi. Nec transitorie legat ejusdem apostoli verba dicentis: *Scientes, quod* 1 Pet. i. 18. *non corruptibilibus argento et auro redempti estis de vana vestra conversatione paternae traditionis, sed pretioso sanguine quasi agni incontaminati et immaculati Jesu Christi.* Beati quoque Joannis apostoli testimonio non resistat dicentis: *Et sanguis Jesu Filii Dei emundat* 1 Ioan. i. 7. *nos ab omni peccato.* Et iterum: *Haec est* 1 Ioan. v. 4. *victoria, quae vincit mundum, fides nostra.* Et: *Quis est, qui vincit mundum, nisi qui credit, quoniam* ib. 5 ff. *Jesus est Filius Dei? Hic est, qui venit per aquam et sanguinem, Jesus Christus; non in aqua solum, sed in aqua et sanguine. Et Spiritus est, qui testificatur, quoniam Spiritus est veritas. Quia tres sunt, qui testimonium dant, Spiritus, aqua et sanguis, et tres unum sunt.* Spiritus utique sanctificationis et sanguis redemptionis et aqua baptismatis; quae tria unum sunt et individua manent nihilque eorum a sui connexione sejungitur: quia catholica ecclesia hac fide vivit, hac proficit, ut in Christo Jesu nec sine vera divinitate humanitas nec sine vera humanitate divinitas.

VI. Cum autem ad interlocutionem examinis vestri Eutyches responderit dicens: *Confiteor ex duabis naturis fuisse Dominum nostrum ante adunationem; post adunationem vero unam naturam confiteor;* miror tam absurdam tamque perversam ejus professionem, nulla judicantium increpatione reprehensam, et sermonem nimis insipientem nimisque blasphemum ita omissum, quasi nihil quod offenderet esset auditum; cum tam impie duarum naturarum ante incarnationem unigenitus Dei Filius fuisse dicatur, quam nefarie, postquam *Verbum caro* Ioan. i. 14. *factum est,* natura in eo singularis asseritur. Quod ne Eutyches ideo vel recte vel tolerabiliter aestimet dictum,

quia nulla vestra est sententia confutatum, sollicitudinis tuae diligentiam commonemus, frater carissime, ut si per inspirationem misericordiae Dei ad satisfactionem caussa perducitur, imprudentia hominis imperiti etiam ab hac sensus sui peste purgetur. Qui quidem, sicut gestorum ordo patefecit, bene coeperat a sua persuasione discedere, cum vestra sententia coarctatus profiteretur se dicere, quod ante non dixerat, et ei fidei acquiescere, cujus prius fuisset alienus. Sed cum anathematizando impio dogmati noluisset praebere consensum, intellexit eum fraternitas vestra in sua manere perfidia, dignumque esse, qui judicium condemnationis exciperet. De quo si fideliter atque utiliter dolet, et quam recte mota sit episcopalis auctoritas vel sero cognoscit, vel si ad satisfactionis plenitudinem omnia, quae ab eo male sunt sensa, viva voce et praesenti subscriptione damnaverit: non erit reprehensibilis erga correctum quantacumque miseratio, quia Dominus noster (Ioan. x. 15.) verus et bonus pastor, qui *animam suam posuit* (Luc. ix. 56.) *pro ovibus suis*, et qui *venit animas hominum salvare, non perdere,* imitatores, nos suae vult esse pietatis; ut peccantes quidem justitia coërceat, conversos autem misericordia non repellat. Tunc enim demum fructuosissime fides vera defenditur, quando etiam a sectatoribus suis opinio falsa damnatur. Ad omnem vero caussam pie ac fideliter exsequendam fratres nostros Julium episcopum et Renatum presbyterum sed et filium meum Hilarum diaconum vice nostra dileximus. Quibus Dulcitium notarium nostrum, cujus fides nobis est probata, sociavimus; confidentes adfuturum divinitatis auxilium, ut is, qui erraverat, damnata sensus sui pravitate salvetur.

Deus te incolumem custodiat, frater carissime.

Data Idibus Junii, Asturio et Protogene viris clarissimis consulibus.

NOTES ON THE TOME

1 *litteris.* Flavian's first letter.

2 *gestorum episcopalium ordine.* The acts of the Home Synod of November, 448.

2 *ordine.* The "record" or "minutes": so ordo is used again § 6, line 296, and Epist. 29.

11 *impia sapere.* Sapere is used to translate *φρονεῖν* in the Vulg. of Matt. xvi. 23, Mark viii. 33; and that is its sense here: "to be impiously (or undutifully) minded." Comp. "recta sapere," "to be rightly minded" in the Collect for Pentecost in the Gregorian Sacramentary.

19 *Symboli initia.* Symbolum (*σύμβολον*) was the name given to the Creed as the "watchword" of the Christian soldier, the "token" whereby he recognized his fellow-soldier: Augustin. Serm. 212. 14; comp. Tertullian's use of "contesseratio" of unity of doctrine, de praescr. haer. 20, 36. Symbolum is therefore strictly applicable to a Baptismal Creed only. Comp. Ruffinus in symb. Ap. 2, "Symbolum enim Graece et indicium dici potest et collatio hoc est quod plures in unum conferunt [Ruffinus is here wrongly confusing *σύμβολον* with *συμβολή*. In what follows he seems to be correct]. Indicium autem vel Signum idcirco dicitur, quia in illo tempore, sicut et Paulus Apostolus dicit, et in Actibus Apostolorum

refertur, multi ex circumeuntibus Judaeis simulabant se esse Apostolos Christi, et lucri alicujus vel ventris gratia ad praedicandum proficiscebant, nominantes quidem Christum, sed non integris traditionum lineis nunciantes, Idcirco istud indicium posuere, per quod agnosceretur is qui Christum vere secundum Apostolicas regulas praedicaret. Denique et in bellis civilibus hoc observari ferunt: quoniam et armorum habitus par, et sonus vocis idem, et mos unus est, atque eadem instituta bellandi, ne qua doli subreptio fiat, symbola distincta unusquisque dux suis militibus tradit, quae Latine 'signa' vel 'indicia' nuncupantur; ut si forte occurrerit quis de quo dubitetur, interrogatus symbolum, prodat si sit hostis vel socius. Idcirco denique haec non scribi chartulis aut membranis sed retineri credentium cordibus tradiderunt, ut certum esset haec neminem ex lectione quae interdum pervenire etiam ad infideles solet, sed ex Apostolorum traditione didicisse."

The most frequent designation of the Creed is πίστις or ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως. The Nicene Creed is termed τὸ μάθημα by Socrates, i. 8, iii. 25.

20 *regenerandorum voce depromitur.* Leo refers to the "Redditio symboli" or recitation of the Creed by the candidates or their sponsors immediately before the administration of Baptism.

25 *indiscretam.* Either "uniform," "confessed by all in common," or else "indivisible," with reference to the close connexion between the three clauses of the Creed which are cited.

27 *credere se in Deum,* etc. Leo here quotes the Roman Creed with the reading "de Spiritu Sancto et Maria Virgine." See note above (p. 40) on ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.

30 *Quibus tribus sententiis*, etc. Comp. Epist. 31 ad Pulcher. "Ipsa Catholica symboli brevis et perfecta confessio . . . tam instructa sit munitione caelesti ut omnes haereticorum opiniones solo ipsius possint gladio detruncari."

33 *de Deo Deus.* This is a reminiscence of the Nicene Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, which was sometimes rendered "Deum ex Deo," as by Hilary, de synod. 84; and sometimes "Deum de Deo," as by Dionysius Exiguus, Mansi, iii. 567.

47 *salva virginitate.* Comp. Tertullian de carne Chr. 23, and see below on "semper virginem."

53 *Liber generationis.* This argument from the genealogy in the Gospel for the reality of Christ's Humanity had been used by Tertullian de carne Chr. 20—a treatise which formed a storehouse of material for subsequent writers.

58 *Ei.* The Vulg. reading in Rom. i. 3.

73 *Magni Consilii Angelus.* So the old Latin versions following the LXX., which condenses the whole of the titles of the Messiah into Μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος. Leo supplements this with the Vulg. reading "Admirabilis," etc.

75 *frustratorie.* "Evasively," "deceptively," *i.e.* emptying the statement "The Word was made Flesh" of its real and proper meaning.

77 *materni corporis veritatem.* Eutyches himself was scarcely committed to this view, since he had under pressure admitted that Christ was co-essential with His mother and with us as to His Manhood (see above, p. 190 f.). But Leo was right in noting that the trend of the Eutychian position was to deny the reality of the

Manhood, and therefore of Christ's Human Body. Some of the extreme Eutychians did actually reproduce the tenet of some Apollinarians (and of the Valentinians) that Christ's Body was not derived from the substance of the Virgin. Tertullian had argued the point very fully de carne Chr. 15, 20, 21. Comp. Leo. Epist. 35 ad Julian, "Qui enim negat verum hominem Jesum Christum necesse est in multis impietatibus impleatur, eumque aut Apollinaris sibi vindicat, aut Valentinus usurpet, aut Manichaeus obtineat: quorum nullus in Christo humanae carnis credidit veritatem."

The same views were revived at the time of the Reformation by some of the Anabaptist sects: see the recantation of Michael Tombe in 1549 (Strype, Cranmer, ii. 8); and how widely and persistently they were disseminated may be gathered from their reiterated condemnation (see the Reform. Leg. Eccles. 5; 32 Henry VIII. cap. 49, § 11, cited by Hardwick Articles, p. 87), and from the emphasis laid upon the true doctrine in the Interpretation of the Creed, Art. III., in the Institution of a Christian Man, 1537; and again in the Necessary Doctrine and Erudition, 1543; the XLII. Articles of 1552, Art. II.; and the Proper Preface for Christmas, 1549.

80 *Mariam semper virginem.* Athanasius is apparently the first writer to give this title (*ἀειπαρθένος*) to the Virgin, Orat. c. Ar. ii. 70. Augustine held the same view (Tract. x. in Joan. ii. 12–21, "Unde fratres Domino? Num enim Maria iterum peperit? Absit. Inde coepit dignitas virginum." Serm. 51; de fid. et symb. 11, "in illo utero nec ante nec postea quidquam mortale conceptum est"; de cat. rud. 40, "virgo concipiens, virgo pariens, virgo moriens"); and such has been the general sentiment of

the majority of Church writers upon the subject. The question has been exhaustively treated by Lightfoot (Essay in his *Galatians*), who upholds the perpetual virginity, and still later by Professor J. B. Mayor (Epistle of St. James, chap. i.), who rejects it. It must, however, be noticed that the term "brethren," used by the evangelists and by St. Paul (comp. Luke ii. 33, 48), cannot in view of the miraculous conception be taken in its simple natural meaning, and it therefore demands *some* explanation. Tertullian's language (adv. Marc. iv. 19, de carne Chr. 7) merely cites the N.T. phrases, and cannot be appealed to on either side. See further, an able paper in *The Guardian* (June 7, 1899), No. 2792, page 700.

84 *non . . . ut per novitatem creationis proprietas remota sit generis.* *i.e.* the novel mode of the cause of the Birth did not remove it from the category of real births.

89 *aedificante sibi sapientia domum.* Comp. Athan. Or. c. Arian. iv. 34.

91 *ex homine.* "From a human being." Homo, like ἄνθρωπος, is used in three senses in ecclesiastical writings: (1) of an individual man, (2) of human nature, (3) of a human being of either sex. Instances of the second meaning will be found Tertullian Apol. 21; Augustin. Encheir. 36; de civ. Dei, xi. 2; Leo. Serm. 28. 6; comp. Te Deum, "Tu suscepisti hominem." For ἄνθρωπος = "manhood," see Athanas. Or. c. Ar. i. 41, 45; ii. 45; iv. 14; c. Apollin. ii. 15, 19; Expos. Fid. 1; and for = "a human being," the words of Anastasius (quoted above, p. 99) given by Socrates, vii. 32.

93 *Salva igitur*, etc. See note above on Cyril. Epist. 2 ad Nest. (page 111).

95 *ab aeternitate mortalitas.* The orthodoxy of this phrase was scrutinized at Chalcedon (Mansi, vi. 972) and defended as agreeable with Cyril's teaching, ubi supra.

102 "*Nostra*" *autem dicimus,* etc. Sin is no part of human nature, but its corruption. The idea is Athanasian, de Incarn. V. Dei, 5.

108 *divina non minuens.* This passage is paraphrased by Pearson on Art. iv. (Oxf. ed. 1877, p. 336); comp. Hooker, v. 54. 4; Athan. de Inc. V. D. 17.

119 *praevaricatoris.* In ecclesiastical Latin this word (with its cognates) loses its technical forensic sense, and is simply equivalent to "peccator." See Rom. ii. 25; Gal. ii. 18 (Vulg.); Tertullian adv. Marc. iv. 43.

125 *pietatis.* Of God's affection and lovingkindness towards us, as in the Gregorian Collects, which stand in our Prayer Book (mistranslated) for v. Epiphany and xxii. Trinity.

125 *sacramento occultiore.* "A more hidden mystery." Sacramentum frequently represents the N.T. μυστήριον. So again below, § 5.

128 *mundi infima.* There is probably an allusion to Ephes. iv. 9. The Greek translator had this reading before him (εἰς τὸ ταπεινὸν τοῦτο τοῦ κόσμου), but some Latin MSS. read *infirma.*

131 *incomprehensibilis.* Literally, of physical, not intellectual, apprehension, "that which cannot be held in the grasp or enclosed in space."

143 *mendacium.* *i.e.* "unreality," "falsity." The Godhead and the Manhood were both equally real. Eutyches would make the latter phantastic.

146 *Agit enim utraque forma . . . injuriis.* This was the second passage questioned at Chalcedon as tending to divide the Two Natures. It was defended by Aetius from Cyril's second letter to Succensus, in which he showed that the Gospel expressions, whether θεοπρεπεῖς or ἀνθρωποπρεπεῖς, belonged to the same Person, not to two Personalities.

171 *Esurire,* etc. Comp. Athan. Or. c. Ar. iii. 32, 34; Cyr. Jer. Catech. iv. 9.

183 *non ejusdem naturæ est dicere,* etc. Leo is here following the later and, for the most part, Western explanation of John xiv. 28. Comp. Epist. 59, "Nec dicimus ejus humanitatem, qua major est Pater, minuere aliquid ejus naturae, quae aequalis est Patri. Hoc aut utrumque unus est Christus qui verissime dixit et secundum Deum 'Ego et Pater unum sumus,' et secundum hominem 'Pater major Me est.'"

Earlier writers, Origen, Tertullian, Alexander, Athanasius, Hilary, understood the "principatus Patris" as inherent in His Personality as the πηγὴ θεότητος. He alone is "of none," while the Son is "begotten of the Father." Thus the Son was regarded as equal in essence but inferior in personality. This was termed the "subordination" of the Persons in the Trinity, springing from their eternal and absolute relations to each other, whereby we speak of them in the "order" of Father, Son, and Spirit. After the Arian controversy the Son's inferiority was more generally referred to His Incarnation. Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Augustine admit both interpretations; Amphilochius, Ambrose, and the author of the "Quicumque" adopt the latter. See Westcott's additional note on John xiv. 28.

185 *Quamvis enim*, etc. This passage was also objected to at Chalcedon and defended by Theodoret from Cyril's Scholia on the Incarnation, 27.

191 *Propter hanc ergo unitatem*, etc. Leo here clearly illustrates the Hypostatic Union and Communicatio Idiomatum. See note on Cyril. Epist. 2 ad Nest., p. 112 f.

211 *a principali petra. i.e.* Christ. Peter as the rock derived his character and name from the Divine archetypal Rock, Christ. So Augustine (Serm. 76 in Matt. xiv., Bened. ed. v. 415), whose words Leo apparently had in mind, "Christus est Petra . . . Petra enim principale nomen est." There is an important passage on this text, which discloses Leo's views, in his Serm. 4 (de Nat. ips. 4), "Tu es Petrus: id est, cum Ego sim inviolabilis petra, Ego lapis angularis qui facio utraque unum, Ego fundamentum praeterquid nemo potest aliud ponere, tamen tu quoque petra es quia Mea virtute solidaris, ut quae Mihi potestate sunt propria, sint tibi Mecum participatione communia." [He had said a little before, speaking of Christian pastors, "Omnes proprie regat Petrus quos principaliter regit et Christus."] But he goes on to explain "super hanc petram" of Peter's confession, "Super hanc fortitudinem aeternum exstruam templum, et ecclesiae Meae caelo inferenda sublimitas in hujus fidei firmitate consurget. Hanc confessionem portae inferi non tenebunt." The point of view, as often in the Fathers, keeps changing. Sometimes Christ is the Rock, sometimes Peter, sometimes Peter's confession; but the general idea is clear enough. Peter was the spokesman of the Apostles' faith, and afterwards the leader in "historical inauguration." As such, either he or his confession may

be termed the rock. Comp. the present writer's note on Tertullian de praescr. haer. 22. Lightfoot, Clement of Rome, ii. 482 foll.

214 *aequalis erit periculi*, etc. Leo expresses the double truth which avoids Docetism on the one side and Psilanthropism on the other. The Saviour of mankind must be God to recreate, redeem, and atone; and Man to discharge the law of obedience and death.

233 *ita sciremus.* *i.e.* holding the indivisible union of the Two Natures unconfused. Comp. the *ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀσυγχύτως* of the Chalc. Definition.

241 *qui solvit Jesum.* This is the Vulgate reading in 1 John iv. 3, and represents a Greek text such as is given in Socrates, vii. 32, *ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν.* It was probably an early gloss upon *ὁ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν,* which recorded another Johannine phrase, *λύειν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*, and which from the Greek crept into the African Latin version, and thence into the Vulgate. Tertullian used it quite naturally (de jejun. 1; adv. Marc. v. 16), and so also the Latin translator of Irenaeus (iii. 17. 8; Harvey, ii. 90) and the Latin Fathers, who were familiar with the Vulgate. Socrates cited it against the Nestorian separation of the Godhead from the Virgin-born. Leo uses it here against the Eutychian annihilation of the Human Nature in Christ.

245 *naturam corporis . . . desipiat.* As Nestorianism issued in Psilanthropism, so Eutychianism involved Docetic views of the Lord's Body and of His Passion, and cut directly at the root of our salvation.

256 *sanguis et aqua.* John xix. 34. That the issue of the Blood showed the reality of Christ's Flesh, and that

of the Water its spotless purity as being the Body of God, was urged by Athanasius, c. Apollin. i. 18. That the double stream symbolized the Atonement and the Cleansing, and was therein connected with the two Sacraments, was a general patristic belief. Comp. Leo again Epist. 16, "Tunc regenerationis potentiam sanxit quando de latere Ipsius profluxerunt sanguis redemptionis et aqua baptismatis." Comp. the Prayer for the Sanctification of the Water in the English Baptismal Service.

260 *Scientes*, etc. 1 Peter i. 18, 19. This and the following citations are not in verbal agreement with the Vulgate. The variations are—Vulg., "auro vel argento . . . immaculati Christi et incontaminati," and in 1 John v. 8, "Quoniam tres sunt qui test. d. in terra . . . et hi tres unum sunt." Late MSS. of the Vulgate also admit the text of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses," on which see Westcott and Hort.

265 *sanguis Jesu Filii Dei.* The Vulgate gives "sanguis Jesu Christi Filii Ejus"; and the Greek, *αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.*

270 *non in aqua solum.* St. John had in mind the Cerinthian separation of the Divine Christ of the Baptism from the human Jesus of the Passion. Leo's application of the text involves the interpretation of the "Spirit" as the Divinity of Christ, and "the water and the blood" as His Humanity.

280 *Confiteor*, etc. See above, p. 190; and comp. Theodoret, Dial. ii. (Lat. Treat. of Athan. Libr. Fath., p. 197).

291 *quia nulla vestra est sententia confutatum.* Eutyches' condemnation in the Home Synod had turned rather on his denial of Two Natures after the Union than on his

affirmation of Two Natures before it. Probably he did not mean actually to assert that Christ's Manhood existed before the Incarnation, and so the phrase was passed over. But Leo, in his letter to Julian of Cos (Epist. 35) of the same date as the Tome, dwells upon it further, and understands Eutyches to have expressed his belief that the Saviour's soul had had a previous existence *in caelis* before its birth of the Virgin, and that Eutyches consequently held a belief which had already been condemned in the case of Origen.

296 *a sua persuasione discedere.* *i.e.* Eutyches had consented, in deference to the synod, to say what he had never said before, that Christ was co-essential with us as to His Manhood.

315 *Julium.* Of the three legates, Julius shrinks into the background at Ephesus before the resolute and tenacious Hilarus; nor do we hear of him again after the close of that disastrous meeting from which Hilarus made a plucky escape without compromising himself or the see of Rome. Renatus died at Delos on his way to Ephesus.

316 *Renatum presbyterum.* A marginal gloss which has crept into some MSS. tells us that Renatus was in charge of the "titular" Church of St. Clement (tituli sancti Clementis). On titulus see Bingham, Ant. viii. 1. 10, and comp. Batiffol, *Hist. du Bréviare Rom.* on the four kinds of churches in Rome: patriarchal, titular (=parochial), diaconal, and martyral (p. 37; edit. 1894).

316 *Hilarum.* Hilarus was Archdeacon of Rome.

THE CHALCEDONIAN
DEFINITION OF THE FAITH

ΑΥΤΗ Η ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ.

ΑΥΤΗ Η ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ.

ΤΑΥΤΗ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΣΤΟΙΧΟΥΜΕΝ.

ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΟΥΤΩ ΦΡΟΝΟΥΜΕΝ.

THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION OF THE FAITH

INTRODUCTION

THE Council summoned for August the first, 449, met in the church of Saint Mary at Ephesus on the eighth, under the presidency of Dioscorus of Alexandria. About one hundred and thirty bishops were present. After the Emperor's letter convening the Council had been read, Hilarus, the Papal legate, requested that Leo's Letters to the Council should be received.* Dioscorus agreed, but some other letters from the Emperor were put in, and in accordance with the wish therein expressed the Council proceeded at once to the question of the faith. Eutyches was introduced. He produced a written confession of faith, to which, when it was read, he added some indignant words concerning the manner of his condemnation by Flavian. Flavian then asked that Eusebius, Eutyches' accuser, should be admitted. This was most inequitably refused, and the Acts of the Home Synod were proceeded with, notwithstanding another attempt on the part of Julius and Hilarus to get Leo's Letters read first.

It was soon obvious that the majority of the members of the Council was dominated by Dioscorus, and when, during the reading of the minutes which recorded

* These were Epist. 28 (The Tome) to Flavian, and Epist. 33, of the same date, to the Synod.

Eusebius' anxiety that Eutyches should confess "Two Natures after the Union," Dioscorus asked if such language was to be endured, his followers anathematized the Eusebian teaching, and acclaimed that of Eutyches as orthodox. Eutyches was then by vote of the Council restored to his position, and the ban of excommunication taken off his community.

The Council proceeded to read and approve the decrees of Ephesus in 431, and to condemn those who should add to the Nicene Faith. Once again Hilarus tried, but unsuccessfully, to bring forward Leo's Letters as agreeable to the truth. Dioscorus now proposed that, in accordance with the Ephesine decrees which laid penalties upon those persons who disturbed them, Flavian and Eusebius should be deposed; and this was actually done, notwithstanding the disclaimer of Flavian and the opposition of the Roman legates. At the actual pronouncement of the sentence, however, some of the bishops, ashamed and alarmed, piteously entreated Dioscorus to desist. He instantly called in the soldiery, and amid a scene of incredible uproar and violence the majority of the bishops were compelled to sign a blank paper, and agree to Flavian's deposition. Those who refused were banished, while Flavian and Eusebius were imprisoned. Such was the tragedy of the "Latrocinium."* With the greatest difficulty Hilarus escaped unhurt, and by taking unusual roads eventually got to Rome.† Three days after the

* Leo's description of the iniquitous assembly. "Nec opus est epistulari pagina comprehendi quidquid in illo Ephesino non judicio sed latrocinio potuit perpetrari" (Epist. 95 ad Pulch.). Comp. Epist. 85, "Illa synodus quae nomen synodi nec habere poterit nec meretur."

† Leo wrote of him (Epist. 44), "Qui vix, ne subscribere per vim coneretur, effugit." Comp. Epist. 45 ad Pulch., and Hilarus' own letter to the Empress (Epist. 46), which describes the Council.

Council closed Flavian expired, of the brutal injuries he had sustained in the synod, at Hypepe in Lydia, whither he had been banished, and Anatolius, Dioscorus' apocrisiarius at Constantinople, was consecrated to succeed him.

Dioscorus' next step was to excommunicate Leo,* who hitherto had received no news of the Council. Hilarus arrived at Rome at the end of September, and the annual autumn synod promptly condemned the Acts of Ephesus, and begged Theodosius to summon a General Council in Italy (Epist. 43 and 44 ad Theodos.). But Theodosius had meanwhile given his authoritative approval to the proceedings at Ephesus, and was not to be moved from this position (apud Leonis Epist. 62, 63, 64). His reply to Leo required him to approve of Anatolius' consecration, which Leo refused to do unless Anatolius would heartily assent to Cyril's Second Letter to Nestorius, the Ephesine Acts of 431, and his own Tome (Epist. 69).

Matters were thus at a deadlock when the death of Theodosius on July 29, 450, and the retirement of Eudocia left Pulcheria sole Empress of the East. On August 25 she married Marcian, a distinguished Thracian soldier, who was elected Emperor, and both she and her husband were devoted to the Catholic cause. Leo had sent four legates to Constantinople to enquire into Anatolius' faith, who were received by the archbishop on their arrival, and Leo's Tome was accepted in a synod and subscribed (Mansi, vii. 92). When Leo was informed of the restoration of union he wished the proposed General Council to be deferred on account of the difficulties which the Western bishops would experience in leaving their sees,

* So Fleury, xxvii. 41, and Neale; Bright would place it later—in the spring of 450, when at Nicaea (*Roman See*, etc., p. 276).

owing to the ravages of the Huns. But Marcian thought it best to proceed, and accordingly on May 17, 451, issued the summons convening a General Council at Nicaea for September 1st. Leo appointed five legates to represent him,* Paschasinus, Lucentius, Boniface, and Basil, who were to act with Julian, bishop of Cos, who was Leo's resident agent at Constantinople.†

The Council met at Nicaea, but was transferred to Chalcedon, as more convenient for the Emperor, and opened in the Martyry of Euphemia on October 8th. Five hundred and twenty bishops were present, the Roman legates presiding, and nineteen imperial commissioners attended from the Emperor. Dioscorus and Eusebius occupied places in the middle as parties concerned.

In the first session the records of the Latrocinium were read, and Dioscorus with some others was con-

* This seems to be the correct number; for in Epist. 90, dated June 26, 451, Leo wrote to Marcian naming Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum in Sicily; Lucentius, a bishop; Boniface and Basil, priests; and Julian of Cos as his representatives. In Epist. 92 he specially asks Julian to act with the four legates already named. In Epist. 93 to the Synod he names Paschasinus, Lucentius, Boniface, and Basil (omitting Julian, who was, as it were, his permanent legate at Constantinople) as the deputies of the Apostolic see. Lucentius and Basil had already been sent to Constantinople to labour with Anatolius for the reconciliation of those who had temporarily lapsed into Eutychianism. Evagrius (ii. 4) recognizes only Paschasinus, Lucentius, and Boniface. The Acts of Chalcedon (Sess. v.: Mansi, vii. 107) name amongst the members of the Definition revision committee Paschasinus, Lucentius, Boniface, and Julian.

† Cos is a small island in the Aegean (modern Kos or Istankoi). Julian discharged the same function at Constantinople for Leo as their apocrisiarii did for the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. At a later time we find Baeda (ii. 1) giving the name "apocrisiarius" to Deacon Gregory, who was the confidential agent of Benedict I. and Pelagius II. at Constantinople, 578–585.

demned. In the second session (Oct. 10) the question of the faith was debated. The Nicene Creed,* the "Creed of the Second General Council," Cyril's Second Letter to Nestorius, and Letter to John of Antioch, and Leo's Tome (in a Greek translation) were read and approved. Some difficulty was at first felt by the Palestinian and Illyrian bishops about three passages in the Tome which insisted upon the distinction of the Two Natures, but they were shown by Aetius of Constantinople and Theodoret to agree with Cyrilline teaching.† The Council was adjourned, and five days granted for the examination of patristic teaching on the question of the faith.‡

The third session (Oct. 13) was wholly occupied with the trial of Dioscorus.§ He disregarded three citations to attend, and was finally deposed on the ground of his uncanonical actions; viz. communion with the condemned Eutyches, tyranny at the Latrocinium, excommunication of Leo, and disobedience to synodical citation.

In the fourth session (Oct. 17) the doctrinal question was resumed. The Tome of Leo was subscribed as agreeable to Nicaea, Constantinople, and Cyril's exposition at Ephesus. Some other matters¶ were disposed of, and the Council adjourned to the following day.

* In a recension which differs only verbally from the original text: *e.g.* καὶ πάλιν is inserted before ἐρχόμενον: τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα becomes τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον: ἢ κτιστόν is omitted from the anathemas (Mansi, vi. 956).

† See above, pp. 210, 211, 212.

‡ Atticus of Nicopolis wished particularly to scrutinize the Tome in the light of Cyril's Third Letter and Anathemas.

§ So the Acts; but Evagrius reverses the order of the business of the second and third sessions (ii. 18).

¶ The case of the Aegyptian bishops who refused to sign without the consent of their patriarch (see canon 30), and the case of Eustathius of Berytus *versus* Photius of Tyre (canons 12, 29).

In the fifth session (Oct. 22) a Definition of the Faith was presented, to which the Roman legates and some Easterns took exception on the ground that it did not speak of Christ as existing *in* Two Natures, as Leo's Tome had implied, but only as *from* Two Natures, which had been accepted in a Eutychian sense. Dioscorus, for instance, had assented to the phrase "from two," but rejected "two."* Others, imagining the opposition to be due to Nestorian sympathies, urged the insertion of Theotokos. Eventually a committee, consisting of Anatolius, four Roman legates, and eighteen bishops, was appointed to revise it, and it was finally accepted in its present form.†

Three days later the Emperor and Empress visited the Council to confirm the faith, and the Definitio was ratified anew.

* Mansi, vi. 692. Cp. Eranistes in Theodor. Dial. 2, "I say that Christ was ἐκ δύο φύσεων, but δύο φύσεις I do not say."

† The last portion of the "Definitio" was based upon Flavian's doctrinal statement which he had drawn up early in 449 at the Emperor's request (Mansi, vi. 541). See Bright's St. Leo, p. 241; and the notes below, p. 237.

ANALYSIS OF THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION OF THE FAITH

§ 1. Introductory.

§ 2. For the preservation of peace, and the removal of error by the grace of Christ we assemble. Holding the Creeds of Nicaea and of Constantinople, and preserving the traditions of Ephesus, we solemnly ratify the

Creed of Nicaea, and the

Creed of Constantinople.

§ 3. Although the Nicene Creed is really sufficient on the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, yet since heresies have arisen—

1. Corrupting the mystery of the Incarnation, and denying to the Virgin Mary the title "Theotokos" (Nestorians);
2. Introducing a mixture or fusion of the Two Natures, making the Divine Nature of the Son passible (Eutychians);

therefore we confirm—

1. The Nicene Creed;
2. The Constantinopolitan Creed;
3. The Two Synodical Epistles of Cyril;
4. The Tome of Leo.

§ 4. The Holy Synod condemns—

1. A Duad of Sons;
2. A passible Divinity in the Son;
3. A mixture or fusion of the Two Natures;
4. A non-human origin of Christ's Body;
5. Two Natures before, but only one after, the Union;

and confesses One and the Self-same Son our Lord Jesus Christ—

{Perfect in Godhead;
Perfect in Manhood:

{Truly God;
Truly Man:

{Co-essential with the Father as to Godhead;
Co-essential with us as to Manhood:

{Begotten of the Father eternally as to Divinity;
Born of the Virgin, Theotokos, temporally as to Humanity:

One Christ IN TWO NATURES, unconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably, according to Holy Scripture, the teaching of Christ, and tradition.

§ 5. No other Creed than the Symbol of the Fathers to be composed or imposed upon intending converts.

DEFINITIO FIDEI APUD CONCILIUM CHALCEDONENSE

DEFINITIO FIDEI APUD CONCILIUM CHALCEDONENSE

Ἡ ἉΓΙΑ καὶ μεγάλη καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος, ἡ κατὰ Θεοῦ χάριν καὶ θέσπισμα τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ φιλοχρίστων ἡμῶν βασιλέων Μαρκιανοῦ καὶ Οὐαλεντιανοῦ Αὐγούστων, συναχθεῖσα ἐν τῇ Καλχηδονέων, μητροπόλει τῆς Βιθυνῶν ἐπαρχίας, ἐν τῷ μαρτυρίῳ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καλλινίκου μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας, ὥρισε τὰ ὑποτεταγμένα.

Ὁ Κυριος ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτὴρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῆς πίστεως τὴν γνῶσιν τοῖς μαθηταῖς βεβαιῶν, ἔφη· Εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν· John xiv. 27. ὥστε μηδένα πρὸς τὸν πλησίον διαφωνεῖν ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι τῆς εὐσεβείας, ἀλλ' ἐπίσης ἅπασι τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐπιδείκνυσθαι κήρυγμα. ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ παύεται διὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ζιζανίων ὁ πονηρὸς τοῖς τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐπιφυόμενος σπέρμασι, καί τι καινὸν κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐφευρίσκων ἀεὶ, διὰ τοῦτο συνήθως ὁ Δεσπότης προνοούμενος τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου γένους, τὸν εὐσεβῆ τοῦτον καὶ πιστότατον πρὸς ζῆλον ἀνέστησε βασιλέα, καὶ τοὺς ἁπανταχῆ τῆς ἱερωσύνης πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀρχηγοὺς συνεκάλεσεν· ὥστε, τῆς χάριτος τοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν Δεσπότου Χριστοῦ ἐνεργούσης, πᾶσαν μὲν τοῦ ψεύδους τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ προβάτων ἀποσείσασθαι λύμην, τοῖς δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας αὐτὴν καταπιαίνειν βλαστήμασιν. ὃ δὴ καὶ πεποιήκαμεν, κοινῇ ψήφῳ τὰ τῆς πλάνης ἀπελάσαντες δόγματα, τὴν δὲ ἀπλανῆ τῶν πατέρων ἀνανεωσάμενοι πίστιν, τὸ τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὼ σύμβολον τοῖς πᾶσι κηρύξαντες, καὶ ὡς οἰκείους τοὺς τοῦτο τὸ σύνθεμα

τῆς εὐσεβείας δεξαμένους πατέρας ἐπιγραψάμενοι· οἵπερ εἰσὶν οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ Κωνσταντινουπόλει συνελθόντες ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα, καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπισφραγισάμενοι πίστιν. ὁρίζομεν τοίνυν, τὴν τάξιν καὶ τοὺς περὶ τῆς πίστεως ἅπαντας τύπους φυλάττοντες καὶ ἡμεῖς τῆς κατ' Ἔφεσον πάλαι γεγενημένης ἁγίας συνόδου, ἧς ἡγεμόνες οἱ ἁγιώτατοι τὴν μνήμην Κελεστῖνος ὁ τῆς Ῥωμαίων, καὶ Κυρίλλος ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων, ἐτύγχανον, προλάμπειν μὲν τῆς ὀρθῆς καὶ ἀμωμήτου πίστεως τὴν ἔκθεσιν τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὼ ἁγίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς μνήμης Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ γενομένου βασιλέως συναχθέντων· κρατεῖν δὲ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἁγίων πατέρων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ὁρισθέντα, πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν μὲν τῶν τότε φυεισῶν αἱρέσεων, βεβαίωσιν δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἡμῶν πίστεως.

Τὸ τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὼ ἐν Νικαίᾳ σύμβολον.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα, παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητήν. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός· Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, Φῶς ἐκ Φῶτος, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα· καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐράνους, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς· καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας· ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι,

ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

Τὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει σύμβολον.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων· Φῶς ἐκ Φῶτος, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμέτεραν σωτηρίαν, κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· σταυροθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός· καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος· Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, καὶ τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν· Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βαπτίσμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μελλοντος αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν.

Ἤρκει μὲν οὖν εἰς ἐντελῆ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐπίγνωσίν τε καὶ βεβαίωσιν τὸ σοφὸν καὶ σωτήριον τοῦτο τῆς θείας χάριτος σύμβολον· περί τε γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκδιδάσκει τὸ τέλειον, καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν τοῖς πιστῶς δεχομένοις παρίστησιν. ἀλλ' ἐπειδήπερ οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀθετεῖν ἐπιχειροῦντες τὸ κήρυγμα, διὰ τῶν οἰκείων αἱρέσεων τὰς κενοφωνίας ἀπέτεκον, οἱ μὲν τὸ τῆς δι' ἡμᾶς τοῦ Κυρίου οἰκονομίας μυστήριον παραφθείρειν τολμῶντες, καὶ τὴν θεοτόκον ἐπὶ τῆς παρθένου φωνὴν ἀπαρνούμενοι· οἱ δὲ σύγχυσιν καὶ κρᾶσιν εἰσάγοντες, καὶ μίαν εἶναι φύσιν τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῆς θεότητος ἀνοήτως

ἀναπλάττοντες, καὶ παθητὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὴν θείαν φύσιν τῇ συγχύσει τερατευόμενοι· διὰ τοῦτο πᾶσαν αὐτοῖς ἀποκλεῖσαι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας μηχανὴν βουλομένη ἡ παροῦσα νῦν αὕτη ἁγία μεγάλη καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος, τὸ τοῦ κηρύγματος ἄνωθεν ἀσάλευτον ἐκδιδάσκουσα, ὥρισε προηγουμένως, τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὼ ἁγίων πατέρων τὴν πίστιν μένειν ἀπαρεγχείρητον. καὶ διὰ μὲν τοὺς τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ μαχομένους, τὴν χρόνοις ὕστερον παρὰ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως συνελθόντων ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἁγίων πατέρων περὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος οὐσίας παραδοθεῖσαν διδασκαλίαν κυροῖ· ἣν ἐκεῖνοι τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐγνώρισαν, οὐκ ὥς τι λεῖπον τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν ἐπάγοντες, ἀλλὰ τὴν περὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος αὐτῶν ἔννοιαν κατὰ τῶν τὴν αὐτοῦ δεσποτείαν ἀθετεῖν πειρωμένων γραφικαῖς μαρτυρίαις τρανώσαντες. διὰ δὲ τοὺς τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας παραφθείρειν ἐπιχειροῦντας μυστήριον, καὶ ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας τεχθέντα Μαρίας ἀναιδῶς ληρῳδοῦντας, τὰς τοῦ μακαρίου Κυρίλλου, τοῦ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας γενομένου ποιμένος, συνοδικὰς ἐπιστολὰς πρὸς Νεστόριον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τῆς ἀνατολῆς, ἁρμοδίους οὔσας ἐδέξατο, εἰς ἔλεγχον μὲν τῆς Νεστορίου φρενοβλαβείας, ἑρμηνείαν δὲ τῶν ἐν εὐσεβεῖ ζήλῳ τοῦ σωτηρίου συμβόλου ποθουντῶν τὴν ἔννοιαν· αἷς καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ τῆς μεγίστης καὶ πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης προέδρου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἁγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Λέοντος, τὴν γραφεῖσαν πρὸς τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Φλαυιανὸν ἐπ᾽ ἀναιρέσει τῆς Εὐτυχοῦς κακονοίας, ἅτε δὴ τῇ τοῦ μεγάλου Πέτρου ὁμολογίᾳ συμβαίνουσαν, καὶ κοινήν τινα στήλην ὑπάρχουσαν κατὰ τῶν κακοδοξούντων, εἰκότως συνήρμοσε πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὀρθοδόξων δογμάτων βεβαίωσιν.

Τοῖς τε γὰρ εἰς υἱῶν δυάδα τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας διασπᾷν ἐπιχειροῦσι μυστήριον, παρατάττεται· καὶ τοὺς παθητὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς λέγειν τολμῶντας τὴν θεότητα, τοῦ τῶν

ἱερῶν ἀπωθεῖται συλλόγου· καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν δύο φύσεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ κρᾶσιν, ἢ σύγχυσιν ἐπινοοῦσιν ἀνθίσταται· καὶ τοὺς οὐρανίου, ἢ ἑτέρας τινὸς ὑπάρχειν οὐσίας τὴν ἐξ ἡμῶν ληφθεῖσαν αὐτῷ τοῦ δούλου μορφὴν παραπαίοντας ἐξελαύνει· καὶ τοὺς δύο μὲν πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως φύσεις τοῦ Κυρίου μυθεύοντας, μίαν δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν ἀναπλάττοντας ἀναθεματίζει. Ἑπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογοῦμεν Υἱὸν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, Θεὸν ἀληθῶς, καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς, τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ (Heb. iv. 15.) αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, Υἱὸν, Κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως, καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ᾽ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Υἱὸν καὶ μονογενῆ Θεὸν, Λόγον Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε, καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον. Τούτων τοίνυν μετὰ πάσης πανταχόθεν ἀκριβείας τε καὶ ἐμμελείας παρ᾽ ἡμῶν διατυπωθέντων, ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος, ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν, ἤγουν συγγράφειν, ἢ συντιθέναι, ἢ φρονεῖν, ἢ διδάσκειν ἑτέρους. τοὺς δὲ τολμῶντας ἢ συντιθέναι πίστιν ἑτέραν, ἤγουν προκομίζειν, ἢ διδάσκειν, ἢ

παραδιδόναι ἕτερον σύμβολον τοῖς ἐθελουσιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐξ Ἑλληνισμοῦ, ἢ ἐξ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ, ἤγουν ἐξ αἱρέσεως οἱασδηποτοῦν, τούτους, εἰ μὲν εἶεν ἐπίσκοποι ἢ κληρικοὶ, ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς τοῦ κλήρου· εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες ἢ λαϊκοὶ εἶεν, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτούς.

NOTES ON THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION OF THE FAITH

7 *μαρτυρίῳ.* A martyry was a memorial church erected over a martyr's tomb, or which contained a martyr's relics. Euphemia was a virgin martyred under Galerius in the Great Persecution in 307. She was regarded with great veneration, and was the patroness of the city of Chalcedon. Arcadius and Gainas had met here in 400 to take a solemn oath of peace (Socr. vi. 6). The church was a stately and magnificent edifice; its beautiful situation is described in picturesque terms by Evagrius, ii. 3.

19 *καὶ τοὺς ἁπανταχῇ.* Routh, following two Latin versions which read "qui undique," suggested ὃς καὶ, but unnecessarily.

23 *αὐτήν.* Either a mistake for *αὐτά*, or = *ποίμνην*, implied in the mention of *προβάτα.*

26 *τὸ τῶν τριακοσίων δεκαοκτὼ σύμβολον.* This was the generally reckoned number of the Nicene Fathers: so Athan. ad Afr. 2, ad Jovian. ap. Theod. H.E. iii. 3, Socr. i. 8, Profess. of Eustathius to Liberius ap. Socr. iv. 12, Evagr. iii. 31, Syn. Epist. of Rom. Counc. in 371 ap. Theod. ii. 22, Canon 1 of Constantinople.

The number was suggestive of the 318 servants of

Abram who rescued Lot, Gen. xiv. 4 (Liberius ap. Socr. *l.c.*), and, as T I H, had been already allegorized as prospective of the Cross and Jesus by the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. 9; by Clement of Alexandria, Strom. vi. 11; and by Ambrose, de fide, *prol.*

44 *πιστεύομεν, κ.τ.λ.* In the second session the Nicene Creed had been read nearly in its original form (see note above, p. 223); but it appears here in a peculiar recension, expanded by the addition of several phrases taken from the revised Jerusalem Creed, which may be taken to be the popular form in which the Nicene Creed was current at Constantinople and its neighbourhood. The additions to the original are these:—

1. *ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν.*
2. *ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.*
3. *σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου.*
4. *καὶ ταφέντα.*
5. *κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.*
6. *καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρός.*
7. *καὶ πάλιν . . . μετὰ δόξης.*
8. *οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.*

Besides these additions *τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα* of Nicaea becomes *τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν*, while *τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ* is omitted after *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο*, and *κτίστον* disappears from the anathemas.

Nestorius was evidently familiar with this form of the Creed, for he quoted (1) and (2), *apud* Cyril. contr. Nest. i. 7, 8, as Nicene, and was corrected by Cyril; while Diogenes of Cyzicus actually accused Eutyches (in session i.) of Apollinarianism because he omitted (3), and was himself set right by the Aegyptian bishops (Mansi, vi. 632).

For dogmatic notes on the additional clauses in the "creed of the 150," see above, pp. 76 foll.

88 *οἰκονομίας.* See note on *οἰκονομικήν*, p. 174.

98 *διὰ μὲν τοὺς τῷ* Π. *τ. ἁ. μαχομένους.* The Macedonians, who were known as the "Pneumatomachi." See Constant. Canon 1 and Socr. ii. 45, Ὁ Μακεδόνιος τὸ Ἅγιον τὸ Πνεῦμα συναναλαβεῖν εἰς τὴν θεολογίαν τῆς Τριάδος ἐξέκλινε . . . . διὰ ταύτην δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ Πνευματομάχους ἀποκαλοῦσιν αὐτους οἱ τὸ ὁμοούσιον φρονοῦντες.

105 *γραφικαῖς μαρτυρίαις.* The context seems to show that by this term the Chalcedonian Fathers meant "Scriptural," not merely "written," testimonies: *γραφικαῖς* will thus refer to the Scriptural epithets added to *τὸ Πνεῦμα.* See the notes above, pp. 76 foll.

110 *συνοδικὰς ἐπιστολάς.* The Second Letter to Nestorius, and the Letter to John of Antioch. The Third Letter to Nestorius with the schedule of anathemas had been read at Ephesus, but, doubtless in consequence of the anathemas, had not been so thoroughly accepted as the Second Letter (see above, p. 160). It was passed over at Chalcedon, but accepted as authoritative along with the Second Letter at the Fifth General Council in 553, apparently on the mistaken ground that it had been similarly received at Chalcedon (Mansi, ix. 341).

127 *ἢ ἑτέρας τινὸς οὐσίας.* *i.e.* "any other *non-human* essence"; comp. Cyril ad Ioan., above, pp. 168, 169.

131 Ἑπόμενοι *τοίνυν, κ.τ.λ.* Here the language of the *Definitio* is an amplification of a portion of Flavian's

"Confession of Faith" which he sent to Theodosius in 449. It may be interesting to give Flavian's words (Mansi, vi. 539; Hahn, p. 320), so that they may be compared with those of the Council. After a brief preamble he proceeds: *Πάντοτε ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς ἑπόμενοι καὶ ταῖς ἐκθέσεσι τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ καὶ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει συνελθόντων καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ τῆς ὁσίας μνήμης Κυρίλλου τοῦ γενομένου ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων· καὶ κηρύττομεν τὸν ἕνα Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνάρχως γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, Θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν προσλήψει ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον τῇ μητρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. Καὶ γὰρ ἐκ* δύο φύσεων ὁμολογοῦντες τὸν Χριστὸν μετὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου καὶ ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει καὶ ἐν ἑνὶ προσώπῳ, ἕνα Χριστόν, ἕνα Υἱόν, ἕνα Κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν· καὶ μίαν μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου φύσιν, σεσαρκωμένην μέντοι καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσασαν, λέγειν οὐκ ἀρνούμεθα διὰ τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν. Τοὺς δὲ δύο υἱοὺς ἢ δύο ὑποστάσεις ἢ δύο πρόσωπα καταγγέλλοντας, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, κηρύττοντας ἀναθεματίζομεν καὶ ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας κρίνομεν.*

* This is the form in which the words were afterwards cited (see Bright, Leo, p. 241), and is probably what Flavian wrote. If so, it would account for *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* appearing in the first draft of the *Definitio*. The ordinary Greek Text, both here (*ἐν*) and in the revised *Definitio* (*ἐκ*), is thus the result of two mistaken attempts at emendation, the true text of both passages having been interchanged.

137 *ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν.* We have already noticed Eutyches' hesitation on this point (see pp. 190 f.). It was probably due to a misunderstanding of two passages in Athanasius, (*a*) ad Serap. ii. 3, where, in reference to the Nature of the Son, he asserts his co-essentiality with the Father but not with creatures; (*b*) de sent. Dion. 10, where he distinguishes the Divine nature co-essential with the Father, and the Human nature diverse in essence from the Father.

The more usual phrase was "co-essential with Mary" or "with His mother"; so Flavian, as cited in the last note, and Leo Epist. 31 ad Pulch. Eutyches in the Home Synod confessed Christ to be "from the flesh of the Virgin, and that He was Perfect Man"; and again, "I confess that the holy Virgin is co-essential with us, and that our God was incarnate of her"; upon which Basil of Seleucia remarked, "If the mother is co-essential with us, He is also, for He was called the Son of Man" (Mansi, vii. 747).

ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν was no doubt at first an anti-Apollinarian watchword adopted by some Catholics as a useful guard against the notion of any conversion of the Godhead into flesh, or non-human origin of Christ's Body. It was not brought into general use until its employment by the Chalcedonian Council in this passage (see Newman's note, Athan. Orations; Lib. Fath. p. 168).

138 *κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.* This phrase is equivalent to Rom. viii. 3, *ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας.* Our Lord took *perfect* Manhood, not *fallen* manhood. His was not "flesh of sin," but like it in every respect, except its sinfulness. Comp. the similar language of the longer Epiphanian Creed: *ἐνανθρωπήσαντα,*

τουτέστι τελείον ἄνθρωπον λαβόντα, ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα καὶ νοῦν καὶ πάντα, εἴ τι ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.

143 *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν.* So Evagr. ii. 4, Euthymius ap. Mansi, vii. 776, and the Latin versions ("in duabus naturis"); and it is undoubtedly the right reading, although the Greek text of the Acts gives *ἐκ δύο φύσεων.* The very point of the Roman legates' objection to the first draft of the *Definitio* was that its *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* was ambiguous and must be altered (Mansi, vii. 105). Routh conjectured that both phrases were admitted into the text *ἐκ δύο φύσεων καὶ ἐν δύο φύσεσιν* (Opusc. ii. 119), but this is not probable: *ἐκ δύο φύσεων,* strictly understood, is heretical.

The phrase "In Two Natures" was misunderstood by the Armenians as favouring Nestorianism, for the translator unfortunately used an Armenian word, in rendering "the one" and "the other" Nature of Christ, which could in that language only be applied to *persons,* not to *things.* Political disturbances had prevented the Armenian bishops from being present at the Council, just as for the same reasons they had been absent from Ephesus in 431, though they loyally accepted the Ephesine decrees. Consequently the Armenian Church never received the Council of Chalcedon as an orthodox synod, and even took the extreme step in 491 of anathematizing its decrees. To this day the Armenian Church remains separated from the Orthodox Churches of the East, although the difference between them is one rather of expression than of doctrine. The Armenians hold that the Divine and Human Natures are united in Christ; and this doctrine is formulated in the phrase "One United Nature," and is publicly professed by every

Armenian cleric at his ordination. The doctrine is that of an *Unconfused* Union, not the *confused* union of Monophysitism. They profess the Perfection of the Two Natures, and do not admit either a Eutychian absorption or a Monophysite mixture or fusion. Comp. a valuable note in Bright's Waymarks in Church History, p. 399.

One may conveniently at this point add that while Eutychianism proper asserted the entire absorption of the Human Nature by the Divine, it was modified after Chalcedon so as to assert one compound nature, neither wholly Divine nor wholly human. This was Monophysitism. Still later, in the seventh century, the controversy assumed another guise, the Monophysites proceeding to the logical consequence of their belief, and denying Two Wills in Christ corresponding to His Two Natures. To exclude this Monothelite heresy the Sixth General Council at Constantinople in 681 found it necessary to insert in its *Definitio Fidei* the affirmation of δύο φυσικὰ θελήματα and δύο φυσικαὶ ἐνέργειαι in Christ. See below in Appendix, p. 248. Comp. Hooker, v. 48. 9. On the history of this subject and its later developments see Ottley, The Doctrine of the Incarnation, ii. 113 foll.

143 ἀσυγχύτως. This teaching was practically that of Tertullian adv. Prax. 27. See also Athan. c. Apoll. i. 10, where he urges a real but unconfused union between the Word and the flesh that He made His own.

ἀσυγχύτως and ἀτρέπτως are directed against the Apollinarian and Eutychian heresies, and exclude the notion of any intermingling of the Natures or alteration of their distinct properties: ἀδιαιρέτως and ἀχωρίστως against the Nestorian, and exclude any division of Person or separation of the once-for-all united Natures. Com-

pare the words put into the mouth of the celebrant, as he holds the Sacred Elements in his hands, in the Liturgy of the Coptic Jacobites (Brightman, i. 185), "I believe that this is the quickening flesh which Thine Only begotten Son our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ took of the lady of us all, the holy Theotokos Saint Mary: He made it one with His Godhead without confusion and without mixture and without alteration . . . I verily believe that His Godhead was not severed from His Manhood for one moment, nor for the twinkling of an eye." And the emphatic statement of our Second Article (taken from Art. III. of the Augsburg Confession), "ita ut duae naturae divina et humana integre atque perfecte in unitate personae fuerint inseparabiliter conjunctae." And the well-known passage in Hooker (v. 54. 10), who sums up the Christological work of the first four Councils in the words *ἀληθῶς* ("truly God"), *τελέως* ("perfectly Man"), *ἀδιαιρέτως* ("indivisibly of Both One"), *ἀσυγχύτως* ("distinctly in that One Both").

144 *οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τ. φύσ. διαφορᾶς, κ.τ.λ.* See the note on Epist. 2 ad Nest. p. 111.

152 Τ*ούτων τοίνυν, κ.τ.λ.* This section merely re-enacts the decision of the Council of Ephesus in 431, canon 7: *ἑτέρα πίστις* meaning here, as there, any other Creed than the Nicene, which there, as here, is transformed from a Conciliar Creed and test of orthodoxy into a Baptismal Symbol for use at the reception of converts. No doubt the decisions of Ephesus and Chalcedon on this point were regarded as disciplinary rather than as doctrinal, and as therefore liable to alteration. Certain it is that in the Western Church the Nicene Symbol has never dis-

placed the baptismal formularies which more or less approximated to the form known as the Apostles' Creed (Swainson, p. 22 f.). Further, the original text of the Nicene Creed, when used in Western liturgies, has been supplanted by the longer recension "of the 150," and even that has been supplemented by the unauthorized "Filioque."

APPENDIX
TO THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION

THE DEFINITIO FIDEI OF THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL AT CONSTANTINOPLE

A.D. 681

Mansi, xi. 636; Hahn, p. 172.

ʽΕΠΟΜΕΝΗ (ἁγία καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος) ταῖς τε ἁγίαις καὶ οἰκουμενικαῖς πέντε συνόδοις καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ ἐκκρίτοις πατράσι καὶ συμφώνως ὁρίζουσα ὁμολογεῖν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν, τὸν ἕνα τῆς ἁγίας ὁμοουσίου καὶ ζωαρχικῆς τριάδος, τέλειον ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, Θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς αὐτόν, ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Πνεύματος ʽΑγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τῆς κυρίως καὶ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν θεοτόκου, κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, Υἱόν, Κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀχωρίστως, ἀδιαιρέτως γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ᾽ ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, Θεοῦ Λόγον, Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ

αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε καὶ τὸ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον. Καὶ δύο φυσικὰς θελήσεις ἤτοι θελήματα ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγχύτως κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκαλίαν ὡσαύτως κηρύττομεν· καὶ δύο μὲν φυσικὰ θελήματα οὐχ ὑπεναντία, μὴ γένοιτο, καθὼς οἱ ἀσεβεῖς ἔφησαν αἱρετικοί, ἀλλ' ἑπόμενον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα, καὶ μὴ ἀντιπίπτον ἢ ἀντιπαλαῖον, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θείῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ θελήματι· ἔδει γὰρ τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς θέλημα κινηθῆναι, ὑποταγῆναι δὲ τῷ θελήματι τῷ θεϊκῷ κατὰ τὸν πάνσοφον Ἀθανάσιον. Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ αὐτοῦ σὰρξ σὰρξ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου λέγεται καὶ ἔστιν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ φυσικὸν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ θέλημα ἴδιον τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου λέγεται καὶ ἔστι, καθά φησιν αὐτός. ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με Πατρός, ἴδιον λέγων θέλημα αὐτοῦ τὸ τῆς σαρκός, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ ἰδία αὐτοῦ γέγονεν· ὃν γὰρ τρόπον ἡ παναγία καὶ ἄμωμος ἐψυχωμένη αὐτοῦ σὰρξ θεωθεῖσα οὐκ ἀνῃρέθη, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αὐτῆς ὅρῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ διέμεινεν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα θεωθὲν οὐκ ἀνῃρέθη, σέσωσται δὲ μᾶλλον κατὰ τὸν θεολόγον Γρηγόριον λέγοντα· τὸ γὰρ ἐκείνου θέλειν, τὸ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα νοούμενον, οὐδὲ ὑπεναντίον θεῷ, θεωθὲν ὅλον. δύο δὲ φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγχύτως ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, τῷ ἀληθινῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν δοξάζομεν, τουτέστι θείαν ἐνέργειαν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνέργειαν, κατὰ τὸν θεηγόρον Λέοντα τρανέστατα φάσκοντα· ἐνεργεῖ γὰρ ἑκατέρα μορφὴ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ὅπερ ἴδιον ἔσχηκε, τοῦ μὲν Λόγου κατεργαζομένου τοῦτο, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ Λόγου, τοῦ δὲ σώματος ἐκτελοῦντος ἅπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ σώματος. οὐ γὰρ δήπου μίαν δώσομεν φυσικὴν τὴν ἐνέργειαν Θεοῦ καὶ ποιήματος, ἵνα

μήτε τὸ ποιηθὲν εἰς τὴν θείαν ἀναγάγωμεν οὐσίαν μήτε μὴν τῆς θείας φύσεως τὸ ἐξαίρετον εἰς τὸν τοῖς γεννητοῖς πρέποντα καταγάγωμεν τόπον· ἑνὸς γὰρ καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τά τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ πάθη γινώσκομεν κατ' ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο τῶν, ἐξ ὧν ἐστι, φύσεων, καὶ ἐν αἷς τὸ εἶναι ἔχει, ὡς ὁ θεσπέσιος ἔφησε Κύριλλος. Πάντοθεν γοῦν τὸ ἀσύγχυτον καὶ ἀδιαίρετον φυλάττοντες συντόμῳ φωνῇ τὸ πᾶν ἐξαγγέλλομεν· ἕνα τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος καὶ μετὰ σάρκωσιν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν, εἶναι πιστεύοντές φαμεν δύο αὐτοῦ τὰς φύσεις ἐν τῇ μιᾷ αὐτοῦ διαλαμπούσας ὑποστάσει, ἐν ᾗ τά τε θαύματα καὶ τὰ παθήματα δι' ὅλης αὐτοῦ τῆς οἰκονομικῆς ἀναστροφῆς οὐ κατὰ φαντασίαν, ἀλλὰ ἀληθῶς ἐπεδείξατο, τῆς φυσικῆς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μιᾷ ὑποστάσει διαφορᾶς γνωριζομένης τῷ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας ἑκατέραν φύσιν θέλειν τε καὶ ἐνεργεῖν τὰ ἴδια· καθ' ὃν δὴ λόγον καὶ δύο φυσικὰ θελήματά τε καὶ ἐνεργείας δοξάζομεν πρὸς σωτηρίαν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου γένους καταλλήλως συντρέχοντα. Τούτων τοίνυν μετὰ πάσης πανταχόθεν ἀκριβείας τε καὶ ἐμμελείας παρ' ἡμῶν διατυπωθέντων ὁρίζομεν ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν, ἤγουν συγγράφειν ἢ συντιθέναι ἢ φρονεῖν ἢ διδάσκειν ἑτέρως. Τοὺς δὲ τολμῶντας ἢ συντιθέναι πίστιν ἑτέραν ἢ προκομίζειν ἢ διδάσκειν, ἢ παραδιδόναι ἕτερον σύμβολον τοῖς ἐθέλουσιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξ Ἑλληνισμοῦ ἢ ἐξ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ ἢ γοῦν ἐξ αἱρέσεως οἵας οὖν, ἢ καινοφωνίαν ἤτοι λέξεως ἐφεύρεσιν πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν εἰσάγειν τῶν νυνὶ παρ' ἡμῶν διορισθέντων, τούτους, εἰ μὲν ἐπίσκοποι εἶεν ἢ κληρικοί, ἀλλοτρίους εἶναι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ τοὺς κληρικοὺς τοῦ κλήρου, εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες εἶεν ἢ λαϊκοί, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτούς.

TRANSLATIONS

THE EPISTLES OF CYRIL

THE TOME OF LEO

THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION OF THE FAITH

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF CYRIL TO NESTORIUS

Cyril to the Most Reverend and God-beloved Fellow-Minister Nestorius, greeting in the Lord.

Certain persons, as I am informed, are, to the detriment of my character, gossiping to thy Piety, and this incessantly, making a special point of attending the gatherings of officials; and, thinking perhaps to bring not altogether unwelcome news to thy ears, they make groundless statements, for they have by no means suffered any injustice, but were quite rightly convicted—one, for having treated the blind and the poor with injustice; another, for having drawn sword against his mother; and the third, for having been associated along with a maid-servant in a theft of money, besides bearing generally a permanent character of a kind that one would not like to attach even to one's bitterest enemy. But what such people say is not a matter of much moment to me, who may not exaggerate my littleness above my Master and Teacher, nor yet above the Fathers. For it is not possible to escape the mischievous attacks of the wicked however one may order one's life. But those men, "whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness," will render their account to the Judge of all. I will turn on the other hand to what more especially becomes my position, and will put thee in mind even now, as a brother in Christ, to make thy method of teaching and thy mental attitude towards

the faith free from all danger to the people, and to bear in mind that "to offend" even only "one of the little ones that believe" in Christ is a ground for the intolerable displeasure (of God). But when the number of those aggrieved is very great we surely stand in need of all possible skill, both to prudently remove the offence and to extend the wholesome doctrine of the faith to those who seek the truth; and this we shall do most properly by being zealous to hold in high esteem the words of the holy Fathers when we light upon them, and, "proving ourselves (as it is written) to see whether we are in the faith," by fashioning right well our own conceptions according to their safe and impregnable opinions.

Now the holy and great Synod (of Nicaea) said that the Only-begotten Son Himself, by nature begotten from God even the Father, Very God from Very God, Light from Light, through whom the Father made all things, came down, was incarnate, lived as Man, suffered, rose the third day, and ascended into heaven. These words and doctrines it behoves us to follow, recognizing what is meant by the Word who is from God being incarnate, and living as Man. For we do not say that the Nature of the Word was changed and became flesh, nor that He was transformed into a complete human being, I mean one of soul and body; but this rather, that the Word, having united to Himself personally, in an ineffable and inconceivable manner, flesh animated with a rational soul, became Man, and was called Son of Man; not merely by His own will and pleasure, nor yet by His simple assumption of a (human) person; and that while the Natures which were brought together into this genuine unity were different, yet of them both is the One Christ and Son, not as though the difference of the Natures was

abolished by the union, but rather the Godhead and the Manhood, by their ineffable and unspeakable consilience into unity, perfected for us the One Lord and Christ and Son. And thus, although He had His existence and was begotten from the Father before the ages, He is spoken of as begotten also after the flesh from a woman; not as though His Divine Nature received its beginning of existence in the holy Virgin, nor yet as though a second generation were necessarily wanting for its own sake after that from the Father, for it is altogether ridiculous and stupid to say that He, who existed before every aeon and is co-eternal with the Father, had need of a second beginning of existence. But when for our sakes and for our salvation the Word, having united humanity to Himself personally, came forth from a woman, He is for this reason said to have been born after the flesh. For it was not an ordinary man, who was first born of the holy Virgin, and upon whom afterwards the Word descended, but Himself, united to humanity from the womb itself, is said to have undergone fleshly birth, as making His own the birth of His own flesh. Thus we say that He both suffered and rose again; not meaning that the Word of God, in His own proper (Divine) Nature, suffered either stripes or the piercing of the nails or any other wounds at all; for the Divinity is impassible because it is also incorporeal. But when that which was made His own body suffered, He Himself is said to suffer these things for us: for the Impassible was in the suffering body.

After the same manner too we conceive of His dying. For the Word of God is by nature immortal and incorruptible and life and life-giving; but when His own body "by the grace of God tasted death for every man" (as Paul saith), He Himself is said to have suffered death for

us; not meaning that He experienced death at all in so far as touches His (Divine) Nature—for it were sheer madness to say or think that—but that His flesh tasted death, as I have just said.

Thus again, too, when His flesh was raised, the resurrection is spoken of as His; not meaning that He fell into corruption, certainly not, but that it was His body that was again raised.

Thus we acknowledge One Christ and Lord; not worshipping a man along with the Word, lest a semblance of division might secretly creep in through the use of the words "along with," but worshipping One and the Same (Lord), because the Word's body wherein He shares the Father's throne is not alien to Himself; in this case again not meaning that there are two Sons in co-session, but One (Son), by reason of His union with His flesh. But if we reject this Personal Union as impossible or as unseemly, we fall into saying "two Sons," and then there will be every necessity for drawing a distinction, and for speaking of the one as properly a man honoured with the title of "Son," and again of the other as properly the Word of God, having naturally the name and possession of Sonship.

Accordingly we must not divide into two Sons the One Lord Jesus Christ; for it will in no way assist the right expression of the faith so to do, even though some promise to admit a Unity of Persons. For the Scripture hath not declared that the Word united to Himself a man's person, but that He hath become Flesh. Now the Word becoming Flesh is nothing else but that "He partook of blood and flesh like us," and made His own a body which was taken (from us), and came forth a man from a woman; not laying aside His being God and His genera-

tion from God the Father, but even in His assumption of flesh remaining what He was.

This (teaching) the statement of the correct faith everywhere sets forth. Thus we shall find the holy Fathers have been minded. Accordingly they confidently called the holy Virgin Theotokos; not meaning that the Nature of the Word or His Godhead received its beginning from the holy Virgin, but that, inasmuch as His rationally animated body to which the Word was personally united was born of her, He is said to have been born after the flesh.

I have thus written to thee out of the love which I have in Christ, and I beseech thee as a brother and "charge thee before Christ and the elect angels" thus to think and teach with us, that the peace of the Churches may be preserved, and the bond of unanimity and love between the priests of God may remain unbroken.

THE THIRD (SYNODICAL) EPISTLE OF CYRIL TO NESTORIUS

Cyril and the Synod assembled in Alexandria from the Aegyptian diocese, to the Most Reverend and Pious Fellow-Minister Nestorius, greeting in the Lord.

Whereas our Saviour plainly said, "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me," what must we feel who are expected by thy Reverence to love thee more than Christ our common Saviour? Who will be able to aid us in the day of judgment? Or what defence shall we invent for thus preserving silence for so long in the face of the blasphemies uttered against Him by thee? And if thou wast injuring thyself only by holding and teaching such things the matter would be of less consequence, but when the whole Church is scandalized and thou hast cast the leaven of thy unwonted and strange heresy amongst the laity—and not only amongst the laity in thy own city, but also in all other places, for the books containing thy expositions are widely circulated—what reason can any longer be given for our silence, or for our forgetfulness of Christ's words, "Think not that I came to send peace upon the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man against his father, and a daughter

against her mother"? For when the faith is wronged, away with filial reverence as inexpedient and precarious; the law of parental and fraternal affection must be abjured; nay, death must be counted as better than life to the godly, "that they may obtain a better resurrection," as it is written.

Now therefore, in harmony with the holy Synod which was assembled in great Rome under the presidency of our most holy and pious brother and fellow-minister Bishop Caelestine, we earnestly conjure thee in this our Third Letter, and counsel thee to desist from those doctrines so mischievous and perverse which thou both holdest and teachest, and to choose instead the right faith which was delivered to the Churches from the beginning through the holy apostles and evangelists who were "eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word"; else, if thy Reverence will not do this within the time appointed in the letters of the said most holy and pious bishop, our fellow-minister of the Church of the Romans, Caelestine, know that thou thyself hast no lot with us, nor place or rank amongst the priests and bishops of God. For it is not possible for us to overlook Churches thus disturbed and laity scandalized and the right faith set at naught and the flock scattered by thee who ought to preserve it, even though thou wert like ourselves a lover of right doctrine following the pious steps of the holy Fathers. Moreover we are all in communion with every one of those who have been excommunicated by thy Reverence on account of the faith, or deposed, both laics and clerics. For it is not just that those who have known how to think aright should be treated unjustly by thy decrees, because they have done well and have spoken in opposition to thee. For this very point hast thou notified in the letter

written by thee to Caelestine our most holy fellow-bishop of great Rome.

Now it will not be sufficient for thy Reverence to simply agree to the symbol of the faith which was put forth in its time by the Holy Spirit by the hand of the great and holy Synod duly assembled in the city of the Nicaeans; for thou hast not rightly understood and interpreted it, but perversely rather, although thou confessest its words with thy mouth. It is more fitting that thou confess in writing and on oath that thou anathematizest thy foul and profane doctrines, and that thou wilt hold and teach what we all do, bishops and teachers and leaders of the laity throughout the West and East. Moreover both the holy Synod at Rome and all of us have assented, as being orthodox and irreproachable, to the letters written to thy Reverence by the Church of the Alexandrians. And we have appended to this our Letter the things which it is necessary to hold and teach and what it is beseeming to reject.

For this is the Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, in the approval of which all the orthodox bishops throughout the West and East unite:

> We believe in One God the Father All Sovereign, Maker of all things visible and invisible;
>
> And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten from the Father, Only-begotten, that is From the Essence of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, Very God from Very God, Begotten not made, co-essential with the Father; through Whom all things were made both in heaven and in earth; Who for us men and for our salvation came down

> and was incarnate and lived as Man; suffered, and rose the third day; ascended into heaven; cometh to judge quick and dead: And in the Holy Spirit.
>
> But those who say "Once He was not," and "Before He was begotten He was not," and that "He was made out of nothing," or who affirm that "the Son of God is of a different Hypostasis or Essence," or "mutable," or "changeable"—these the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.

Following in every respect the confessions of the holy Fathers which they made by the Holy Spirit speaking in them, and pursuing their line of thought and taking as it were the royal highway, we say that the Only-begotten Word of God Himself, who is begotten from the Father's very Essence, who is Very God from Very God, Light from Light, through whom all things were made both in heaven and in earth, came down for the sake of our salvation and abased Himself unto emptiness, and was incarnate and lived as Man; that is, He took flesh of the holy Virgin and made it His own from the womb, and underwent a birth like ourselves and came forth Man from a woman, not indeed casting off what He was, but even though He became Man by the assumption of flesh and blood He still remained God in Nature and in truth. And we do not say either that the flesh was changed into the Nature of Godhead, or indeed that the ineffable Nature of God the Word was perverted into that of flesh, for He is immutable and unalterable, ever abiding the Same, according to the Scriptures; but while visible as a babe in swaddling clothes, and yet in the bosom of the Virgin who bare Him, He was filling all creation as God,

and was enthroned with Him who begat Him. For the Divinity is immeasurable and without magnitude, nor does it admit of circumscription.

Confessing then that the Word was united personally to flesh, we worship One Son and Lord Jesus Christ, neither putting apart and dividing Man and God as though they were joined to one another in a union of dignity or authority, for this would be empty words and nothing else; nor again calling the Word from God "Christ" separately, and in like manner the one (born) from a woman another "christ" separately; but knowing One only Christ, the Word from God the Father, with His own flesh; for then (when He became flesh) He was anointed as Man with us, while yet it is He Himself that giveth the Spirit to those who are worthy to receive it, and that "not by measure," as saith the blessed evangelist John. Nor again do we say that the Word from God dwelt in one who was born of the holy Virgin as in an ordinary man, lest Christ should be thought of as a man carrying God (within him). For though "the Word did tabernacle amongst us," and it is also said that in Christ there dwelt "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," yet we understand that when He became Flesh the indwelling is not to be defined as existing in Him after the same mode that there is said to be an indwelling in the saints, but being united as to Nature and not turned into flesh He effected such an indwelling as the soul of man may be said to have in its own body.

There is therefore One Christ and Son and Lord, not as though a man were joined with God in a unity of dignity or authority, for equality of honour does not unite natures, as for instance in the case of Peter and John, who are equal in honour with one another, inasmuch as

they are apostles and holy disciples, yet the two are not one; nor again do we understand the mode of the conjunction to be that of juxtaposition, for this is inadequate to express a union of natures; nor again of acquired participation, such as that whereby we, "being joined to the Lord," are (as it is written) "one spirit" with Him. Indeed, we reject the term "conjunction" as not sufficiently expressive of the "union." Nor again do we call the Word from God the Father the God or Lord of Christ, lest we should again manifestly sever into two the One Christ and Son and Lord, and fall under the charge of blasphemy by making Him God and Lord of Himself. For the Word of God, personally united to flesh, as we have already said, is God of the universe and Lord of all. He is neither His own servant nor His own Lord; for it were folly or rather positive impiety so to think or say. He did indeed say that God was His own Father, while yet being God by Nature and from the Essence of the Father, but we are not ignorant that along with His being God He also became Man and was under God, according at least to the law which is becoming to the nature of humanity. But how could He become the God or Lord of Himself? Therefore, as Man and as far as pertains to what befits the bounds of His emptying, He says that He is under God along with us. So He became also "under law," while yet as God He Himself spake the Law and is originally the Law-giver.

We refuse to say of Christ, "I reverence him that was borne on account of the Bearer: for the sake of Him who is invisible I worship him who is seen." It is, moreover, horrible to say, "He that is assumed is styled God along with Him who assumed him." For he who thus speaks makes again two separate Christs, and sets a man

on one side apart by himself, and God similarly. For such a one confessedly denies the union, according to which He is not worshipped as one person with another, nor does He share the style of God, but One Christ Jesus is conceived of, the Only-begotten Son, honoured with one worship along with His own flesh.

Now we confess that He Himself, the Son begotten from God the Father, and God Only-begotten, while yet in His own Nature impassible, suffered in the flesh for us according to the Scriptures, and was in His crucified body impassibly making His own the sufferings of His own flesh; for "by the grace of God He tasted death for every man," yielding His own body to it, while yet by Nature He was "Life" and Himself "the Resurrection." For having trampled upon death in His ineffable might, it was in order that He might in His own flesh become "the first-begotten from the dead" and "the firstfruits of them that slept," and open a way for the nature of man to return to incorruption, that "by the grace of God He tasted death for every man," as we just said, and returned to life again on the third day, having spoiled Hades. So that even if it be said, "By man came the resurrection of the dead," yet we understand that "man" to be the Word begotten from God, and that through Him has the might of death been destroyed. And He will come in due season as One Son and Lord in the glory of the Father "to judge the world in righteousness," as it is written.

And we must add this also. Proclaiming the death in the flesh of the Only-begotten Son of God, that is, of Jesus Christ, and confessing His return to life from the dead and His ascension into heaven, we celebrate the bloodless service in the Churches, and we thus approach the sacramental gifts and are sanctified, being partakers

both of the holy flesh and of the precious blood of Christ the Saviour of us all; not receiving it as common flesh—surely not!—nor as the flesh of a man sanctified and associated with the Word in a unity of dignity, or at least as having a Divine indwelling, but as truly life-giving as the Word's very own. For being naturally Life as God, when He became One with His own flesh He rendered* it life-giving. So that although He says to us, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood"; yet we shall not reckon it to be the flesh of a man like one of ourselves—for how could the flesh of a man be life-giving in its own nature?—but as having become truly the own flesh of Him who for our sakes both became and was called Son of Man.

Again, we do not assign the sayings of our Saviour in the Gospels to two several hypostases or two several persons. For the One and Only Christ is not twofold, although He is understood as constituted out of two different substances into an inseparable unity; just as man also is understood to consist of soul and body, and yet is not twofold, but one out of both. But if we think aright we shall hold that both the human sayings and the Divine were spoken by One Person. For when He says, appropriately to His Divine Nature, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," and "I and the Father are One," we recognize His Divine and ineffable Nature, according to which He is One with His own Father because of the identity of Essence, being His "Image" and "Expression" and "the Effulgence of His Glory."

* For this sense of *ἀποφαίνειν* see Epist. ad Joan. *ad init.;* Lit. of Apost. Const., *ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Brightman, i. 21).

But when, not despising the limitation involved in His Humanity, He says to the Jews, "Now ye seek Me, a man who hath spoken to you the truth," again we no less fully know Him, even from the limitations of His Humanity, as God the Word in equality and likeness of His Father. For if it is necessary to believe that, being God by Nature, He became Flesh, that is, Man endowed with a rational soul, what reason could one have for feeling ashamed of certain sayings of His being such as befit His Humanity? For if He were to decline to use the words which befit Him as Man, who compelled Him to become Man like ourselves? Why should He, who for our sakes humbled Himself unto a voluntary Self-emptying, decline to use words befitting that Self-emptying? To One Person then undoubtedly must be attributed all the sayings in the Gospels, namely, to the One Hypostasis Incarnate of the Word. For "there is One Lord Jesus Christ," according to the Scriptures.

And if He is called also "the Apostle and High-priest of our confession," as being the priestly minister to God the Father of the confession of faith which is offered on our part to Him, and through Him to God the Father, and moreover also to the Holy Spirit, again we say that He is by Nature the Only-begotten Son of God, and we do not attribute to a man other than He either the name or the actuality of the priesthood. For He has become a "Mediator between God and men" and a Reconciler for peace, having offered Himself "for an odour of a sweet savour" to God even the Father. Wherefore also He affirmed, "Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not: in whole burnt offerings and sin offerings Thou hast no pleasure, but a body didst Thou prepare for Me. Then said I, Lo, I am come (in the roll of the book it is written

concerning Me) to do, O God, Thy will." For He hath offered His own body "as an odour of a sweet savour" for us, and not surely for Himself. For what offering or sacrifice did He need for Himself, who as God was superior to all sin? For if "all sinned and came short of the glory of God," inasmuch as we have become inclined to turn aside, and the nature of man is diseased with sin—though He is not so—and we have therefore failed of His glory, how can there be any doubt left that the True Lamb has been slain for us men and on our behalf? And to say that He offered Himself both for Himself and for us will by no means escape the charge of blasphemy. For He hath not offended in any way nor committed sin. What offering then was needed, when there was no sin for which it could be made with any show of reason?

And when He says concerning the Spirit "He shall glorify Me," we shall not say, if we understand it aright, that the One Christ and Son received glory from the Holy Spirit as though He needed a glory which was from Another; for His Spirit is not superior to Him and above Him. But since for the manifestation of His Godhead He used His own Spirit for majestic works, He says that He was glorified by Him; just as if one of us were to say concerning his strength, for instance, or his skill in anything, "They shall glorify me." For although the Spirit exists in His own proper Personality and accordingly is conceived of by Himself, inasmuch as He is Spirit and not Son, yet He is not therefore alien from Him; for He is named "Spirit of Truth," and Christ is "the Truth"; and He is poured forth from Him just as He is also of course from God the Father. Accordingly the Spirit, even by working wonders through the hand of the holy Apostles after the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ into heaven,

glorified Him. For it was believed that He must be God by Nature when He Himself was working through His own Spirit. Wherefore also He affirmed "He shall receive of Mine and shall announce it to you." And we are not at all intending to say by this that the Spirit is wise and powerful by participation; for He is all-Perfect, and not lacking in all (possible) good. And since He is Spirit of the Father's Power and Wisdom, that is, of the Son, He is Wisdom and Power in very deed.

But since the holy Virgin brought forth after the flesh God personally united to flesh, for this reason we say that she is Theotokos; not as though the nature of the Word had its beginning of existence from flesh;—for He "was in the beginning," and "the Word was God," and "the Word was with God," and He is Himself the Maker of the ages, co-eternal with the Father, and the Creator of the whole;—but, as we have already said, since He personally united to Himself Manhood, He also underwent a fleshly birth from her womb;—not that He needed either necessarily or on account of His own Nature the birth in time and in the last ages of the world;—but that He might bless the very beginning of our existence; and that the curse on all the race which sends to death our bodies, which are from the earth, might be made to cease thenceforth by a woman bearing Him united to flesh; and that when the sentence "In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children" was annulled by Him, the prophet's words should be shown to be true, "Death in its might swallowed [us] up, and on the other hand God wiped away every tear from every face." For, for this cause we say that He Himself in virtue of His Incarnation blessed marriage, and went when He was invited in Cana of Galilee with His holy apostles.

These doctrines we have been taught to hold by the holy apostles and evangelists and all the God-breathed Scriptures, and from the true confession of the blessed Fathers. And all these it behoves thy Reverence to agree to and maintain without any guile.

Now the points which it is necessary for thy Reverence to anathematize are appended to this our Letter.

I. If anyone confesseth not Immanuel to be God in truth and the holy Virgin on this ground to be Theotokos, since she brought forth after the flesh the Word of God who became flesh, be he anathema.

II. If anyone confesseth not that the Word who is from God the Father hath been personally united to flesh, and is One Christ with His own flesh—the Same, that is to say, God and Man alike—be he anathema.

III. If anyone divideth the hypostases after the union in respect of the One Christ, connecting them by a mere association in dignity or authority or rule, and not rather by a conjunction of real union, be he anathema.

IV. If anyone assigns to two persons or hypostases the words of the evangelic or apostolic writings, which are spoken either of Christ by the saints or of Himself by Himself, and applies some to a man considered apart from the Word who is from God, and others, as God-befitting, solely to the Word from God the Father, be he anathema.

V. If anyone dares to call Christ a God-bearing man, and not rather truly God, as being One Son, and that by Nature, inasmuch as the Word has become Flesh and partaken of blood and flesh like unto us, be he anathema.

VI. If anyone says that the Word who is from God the Father is God or Lord of Christ, and does not rather confess the Self-same to be alike God and Man, the Word

having become Flesh, according to the Scriptures, be he anathema.

VII. If anyone says that Jesus, as a man, was energized by God the Word and clothed with the glory of the Only-begotten, as being different from Him, be he anathema.

VIII. If anyone dares to assert that the man assumed ought to be co-worshipped with God the Word and co-glorified (with Him) and with Him styled God as if one person with another;—for the continual addition of the word "with" compels one to understand this;—and does not rather honour Immanuel with one worship and render to Him one doxology, inasmuch as the Word has become Flesh, be he anathema.

IX. If anyone says that the One Lord Jesus Christ was glorified by the Spirit, using the power which came through Him as if it were foreign to Himself, and that He received from Him the power of working against unclean spirits and of fulfilling divine signs and tokens, and does not rather say that the Spirit was His own, through whom also He wrought the divine signs, be he anathema.

X. The divine Scripture asserts that Christ was made "the High Priest and Apostle of our confession"; moreover He offered Himself for us "as an odour of sweet savour" to God even the Father. If anyone therefore says that it was not the Word Himself who is from God who was made High Priest and our Apostle when He was made flesh and man like us, but as it were another one born of a woman, considered separately from Him: or if anyone says that He offered the sacrifice for Himself also, and not rather solely for our sakes,—for He "who knew no sin" would have no need of a sacrifice,—be he anathema.

XI. If anyone does not confess the flesh of our Lord to be life-giving and the own flesh of the Word Himself who is from God, but (regards it) as the flesh of some other than Himself conjoined to Him in dignity, or having a mere divine indwelling, and not rather life-giving, as we affirm, because it became the own flesh of the Word who hath strength to quicken all things, be he anathema.

XII. If anyone does not confess that the Word of God suffered in flesh and was crucified in flesh and "tasted of death" in flesh and became "Firstborn from the dead," inasmuch as He is Life and Life-giving, as God, be he anathema.

THE EPISTLE OF CYRIL TO JOHN OF ANTIOCH

To my lord, beloved brother, and fellow-minister John, Cyril, greeting in the Lord.

"Let the heavens rejoice and let the earth be glad," for "the middle-wall of the hedge" has been broken down and the distress has been made to cease and the cause of all dissension has been removed, Christ our common Saviour rewarding His Churches with peace, the most orthodox and God-beloved emperors, moreover, inviting us thereto, who, having become most excellent imitators of ancestral orthodoxy, preserve the right faith sure and unshaken in their own souls: moreover they make a special care of His holy Churches, that they themselves may have renowned glory for ever and render their empire most illustrious: to whom also the Lord of Hosts assigns blessings with a rich hand, and permits them to prevail over their antagonists and graces them with victory. For He might not speak falsely who said, "As I live, saith the Lord, them that honour Me I will honour."

When, then, my lord Paul, the brother and fellow-minister most dear to God, arrived at Alexandria, we were filled with joy,—and very reasonably, seeing that such a man was acting as mediator, and had elected to encounter excessive toils in order to vanquish the envy

of the devil and to heal divisions and, by the removal of the stumbling-blocks cast between us, to crown both our Churches and yours with unanimity and peace. It is needless to recount the ground of their division: better is it, I take it, to think and speak rather of matters which befit a time of peace.

Delighted were we at our intercourse* with that most pious man, who probably thought that he would have no little difficulty in persuading us that it was a duty to unite the Churches in peace and to stop the laughter of the heterodox and to blunt the sting of the devil's contumacy. But he found us so readily disposed for this that he had absolutely no trouble at all; for we remembered the words of the Saviour, "My peace I give to you, My peace I leave with you"; moreover we have been taught to pray, "O Lord our God, give us peace, for Thou gavest us all things." So that if one becomes a participator in the peace which is abundantly supplied by God, he will not lack any good thing.

But that the dissension which arose between the Churches was quite needless and inexcusable we have now been fully convinced, since my lord the most God-beloved bishop Paul has proferred a paper which contained an unimpeachable confession of the faith, which he affirmed had been drawn up by thy Holiness and the most pious bishops in that place. The document is as follows, and it is inserted in this our letter word for word:—

> Now in the matter of how we think and speak concerning the Virgin Theotokos and the manner

* *συντοχία* often bears the sense of "conference," "interview," in ecclesiastic Greek, being almost synonymous with ὁμιλία. E. A. Sophocles' Lexicon gives several examples.

of the Incarnation of the Only-begotten Son of God, we must briefly state, not by way of supplement (to the Nicene Creed), but in the nature of full belief, as we have held from the first, having received it both from the divine Scriptures and from the tradition of the holy fathers, making no addition at all to the Creed of the holy fathers put forth at Nicaea. For, as we have just said, it suffices both for all knowledge of orthodoxy and for the exclusion of all heretical blasphemy. And we will state it, not daring impossibilities, but in the acknowledgment of our own infirmity, to exclude those who attack us on the ground that we are looking into things beyond the power of man.

We confess, then, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, Perfect God and Perfect Man of a rational soul and body; before the ages begotten from the Father as to His Godhead, and in the last days the Self-same for us and for our salvation, (born) of Mary the Virgin as to His Manhood; the Same co-essential with the Father as to Godhead and co-essential with us as to Manhood, for there was a Union of Two Natures, whereby we confess One Christ, One Son, One Lord. And according to this idea of the unconfused Union we confess the holy Virgin to be Theotokos, because that God the Word was incarnate, and lived as Man, and from the very conception united to Himself the temple which He took of her.

And with regard to the evangelic and apostolic sayings concerning the Lord, we know that theologians make some common, as relating to One Person, and distinguish others, as relating to Two

Natures, interpretating the God-befitting ones of the Godhead of Christ, and the lowly ones of His Humanity.

On reading these your holy words and finding that we ourselves also thus think—for "there is One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism"—we gave glory to God the Saviour of the world, and congratulated each other that both our Churches and yours hold a faith agreeing with the God-breathed Scriptures and with the tradition of the holy Fathers. But when I learnt that certain of those who are wont to be censorious were buzzing around like fierce wasps, and were spitting out villainous words against me as though I said that the holy body of Christ was brought down from heaven and was not (taken) from the holy Virgin, I thought it necessary to add a few words on this topic in answer to them. O foolish ones, knowing only how to falsely accuse! How were ye thus mentally perverted so as to have fallen sick of such monstrous folly? For it is your absolute duty to clearly understand that well-nigh the whole of our contest for the faith has been waged round our affirmation that the holy Virgin is Theotokos. But if we say that the holy body of Christ our common Saviour is from heaven and was not made from her, how could she be any longer understood to be Theotokos? For whom has she at all brought forth, if it is not true that she begat after the flesh Immanuel? Let those then who have prated these things about me be ridiculed; for the blessed prophet Isaiah did not lie when he said, "Behold, the Virgin shall be with Child and shall bear a Son, and they shall call His Name Immanuel"; and altogether truly did the holy Gabriel speak to the blessed Virgin, "Fear not, Mary; for thou didst find favour with God; and behold, thou shalt conceive and

bear a Son, and thou shalt call His Name Jesus." "For He shall save His people from their sins." But when we speak of our Lord Jesus Christ being "from heaven" and from above, we do not use these expressions as meaning that His holy flesh was brought from above and from heaven, but we follow rather the divinely-speaking Paul who plainly cried, "The first man is from earth, of mould: the Second Man is [the Lord] from heaven." Moreover we remember too the Saviour saying, "No one hath ascended into heaven but He that came down from heaven, the Son of Man"; although He was born according to the flesh, as I have just said, of the holy Virgin. But since God the Word who came down from above and from heaven "emptied Himself, taking servant's form," and was called "Son of Man," still remaining what He was, that is, God—for He is immutable and unalterable by Nature—He is therefore now conceived of as One with His own flesh, and is said to have come down from heaven, and is moreover named "Man from heaven," being perfect in Godhead and perfect in Manhood, and conceived of as in One Person; for "there is One Lord Jesus Christ," although the difference of the Natures is not ignored, from both of which we say that the ineffable Union hath been wrought.

As for those who say there was a mixture or confusion or blending of God the Word with the flesh, let thy Holiness deem it well to stop their mouths; for it is likely that some are commonly reporting this also about me, as though I had either thought or said so. But I am so far from thinking such a thing that I deem those to be actually out of their mind who can for a moment suppose it possible for a shadow of turning" to take place in respect of the Divine Nature of the Word; for

He ever abides what He is and has not been changed, neither indeed could He ever be changed or be capable of variation. Besides, we all confess the Word of God to be naturally impassible, although in His all-wise administration of the mystery (of the Incarnation) He is seen to attribute to Himself the suffering which befell His own flesh. Thus likewise, saith the all-wise Peter, "Christ then suffered for us in flesh," and not in the nature of the ineffable Godhead. For in order that He Himself may be believed to be the Saviour of the world He takes upon Himself, as I said, the sufferings of His own flesh in accordance with the appropriation inherent in the Incarnation; much as He was foreannounced by the prophet's voice as of Him, "I gave My back to the scourges, My cheeks to blows, and My face I turned not away from the shame of spitting."

Now that we follow in all respects the opinions of the holy fathers, but especially those of our blessed and all-renowned father Athanasius, refusing to be carried in the very least beyond them, let thy Holiness be persuaded and let no one else feel any doubt. I would also have set down many passages of theirs, guaranteeing my own words from theirs, had not I feared the length of the letter lest it should thereby become tedious.

And we do not suffer the faith to be in any way shaken by anyone, which was defined—I mean the Symbol of the faith—by our holy fathers who assembled in their time at Nicaea; nor do we permit either ourselves or others either to alter a word of what is there laid up, or to transgress a single syllable; remembering Him who said, "Remove not the eternal bounds which thy fathers set." For they themselves were not the speakers, but the Spirit of God even the Father, who proceedeth indeed from

Him, yet is not alien from the Son, at least in respect of essence. Indeed, the words of the holy teachers guarantee this to us. For in the Acts of the Apostles it is written, "When they came opposite Mysia they attempted to go into Bithynia, and the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not." The divinely-uttering Paul also writes, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God, but ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if anyone have not the Spirit of Christ he is not His." But when any of those who are wont to pervert the right turn aside my words to what they please, let not thy Holiness marvel, being aware that those also of every heresy find the starting-points for their own error out of the God-breathed Scriptures, corrupting by their own evil notions what has been rightly written by the Holy Spirit, and pouring over their own heads the unquenchable flame.

But since we have learnt that certain persons have corrupted the epistle of our all-renowned father Athanasius to the blessed Epictetus, which is orthodox, and have published it so that thereby many are injured, we have therefore, in our thought of something useful and necessary for the brethren, sent duplicates to thy Holiness made from ancient copies which are here with us, and which are free from error.

The Lord shall keep thee in good health and praying for us, most honoured brother.

THE TOME OF LEO

Leo, bishop, to his dearest brother Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople.

On reading the letter of your Affectionateness, at the late arrival of which we wonder, and on reviewing the minutes of the acts of the bishops, we at length discovered the scandal which had arisen in your midst in opposition to the integrity of the faith, and what formerly appeared obscure, now that it has been explained to us, has become perfectly clear. In this matter Eutyches, who might reasonably have been thought worthy of esteem as a presbyter, shows himself to have been very short-sighted and far too inexperienced, so that the prophet's words are true too of him: "He was unwilling to learn that he might do good; he meditated wickedness upon his bed." For what is more wicked than to be undutifully minded, and to refuse to yield to those who are wiser and more learned than ourselves? But into this folly do those persons fall who, when they are hindered from arriving at the truth by some obscurity, have recourse not to the voices of the prophets or the letters of the apostles or the gospel authorities, but to themselves, and on this account they become teachers of error because they were not disciples of the truth. For what learning has such a one acquired from the sacred pages of the New and the Old Testament, seeing that he

does not understand even the opening words of the creed? And that which is proclaimed throughout the whole world by the voices of all candidates for baptismal regeneration has not yet been understood by the heart of your aged presbyter.

2. And so, being ignorant of what he ought to think about the Incarnation of the Word of God, and unwilling, with a view to acquiring the light of intelligence, to make research in the wide extent of the Holy Scriptures, he yet might at least have received with careful attention the general and common confession with which all the faithful profess that they

"believe in God the Father Omnipotent,
and in Jesus Christ His Only Son Our Lord,
who was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary,"

by which three sentences the machinations of almost all heretics are destroyed. For when God is believed to be both Omnipotent and Father, and the Son is shown to be co-eternal with Him, in nothing differing from the Father because He is "God of God," Omnipotent of Omnipotent, begotten Co-eternal of the Eternal; not later in time, not unlike in glory, not divided in essence; but the Self-same, who was the Only-begotten and Everlasting One of the Everlasting Parent, was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary. And this birth in time takes away nothing from that divine and eternal birth, nor does it add anything to it, but it is entirely concerned with the reparation of man who had been deceived, so that it might both conquer death and by its own power destroy the devil, who held the sovereignty of death. For we should not have been able to overcome the author of sin and death had He not taken our nature and made it His own, whom neither could sin pollute nor death

detain. For He was conceived of the Holy Spirit within the womb of the Virgin Mary, who brought Him forth just as she had conceived Him, preserving her virginity. But if he was not able to imbibe a right knowledge from this purest fount of Christian faith, because he had obscured the brightness of the clear truth by a darkness peculiar to himself, Eutyches might have submitted to the Gospel teaching, and on reading Matthew's words: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham," he should have sought further instruction from the apostle's preaching; and when he read in the Epistle to the Romans: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, a called apostle, separated for the gospel of God which He had promised before by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures about His Son who became to Him of the seed of David according to the flesh," he should have studied the pages of the prophets with dutiful attention. And when he found the promise of God to Abraham, which says, "In thy seed shall all nations be blessed," to prevent all doubt as to the peculiar privilege of this seed, he should have given heed to the apostle when he says, "To Abraham were the promises made, and to his seed. He saith not 'and to seeds,' as if it applied to many, but as to one—'and to thy seed,' which is Christ." Isaiah's prophecy also he should have listened to with the inward ear when he says, "Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call His name 'Immanuel,' which is, being interpreted, 'God is with us.'" And he should have read with faith the words of the same prophet, "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, whose power is on His shoulder, and they shall call His name the Angel of Great Counsel, Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Prince of Peace, the

Father of the Coming Age." And he should not, using deceptive words, say that the Word was made Flesh in such wise as to imply that Christ, having been conceived in the Virgin's womb, possessed the form of a man without a real body taken from His mother. Perhaps he thought that our Lord Jesus Christ was not of our nature because the angel sent to the blessed Mary ever-virgin said, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that Holy Thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God,"—as if, because the conception by the Virgin was of Divine operation, the flesh of Him conceived was not of the nature of her who conceived it. But that birth, uniquely wonderful and wonderfully unique, is not to be understood as losing its true character because of the novelty of its origin. For the Holy Spirit made the Virgin bring forth, but it was a real body taken from her body; and "when Wisdom was building for Herself a house" "the Word was made Flesh and dwelt amongst us,"—that is, in that flesh which He took from a human being, and which He animated with the spirit of a rational life.

3. Since then the properties of both natures and substances were preserved and co-existed in One Person, humility was embraced by majesty, weakness by strength, mortality by eternity; and to pay the debt of our condition the inviolable nature was united to a passible nature; so that, as was necessary for our healing, there was one and the same "Mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ," who was capable of death in one nature and incapable of it in the other. In the complete and perfect nature, therefore, of very man, very God was born —complete in what belonged to Him, complete in what

belonged to us. And by "what belonged to us" we mean what the Creator put in us from the beginning, and what He undertook to repair. For that which the Deceiver brought upon us and that which deceived man admitted found no trace in the Saviour. And it does not follow that because He shared in human weakness He therefore shared in our sins. He assumed the "form of a servant" without the stain of sin, enhancing what was human, not detracting from what was Divine; because that "Self-emptying," by which He who is invisible rendered Himself visible and He who alone is the Creator and "Lord of all" willed to be mortal, was a condescension of pity, not a loss of power. Hence He who, remaining in the "form of God," made man was the Same who was made man in the "form of a servant." For each nature retains without loss its own properties; and as the "form of God" does not take away the "form of a servant," so the "form of a servant" does not detract from the "form of God." For because the devil was boasting that man, deceived by his fraud, had lost the Divine gifts, and, being stript of the dowry of immortality, was undergoing the hard sentence of death, and that he himself derived a certain solace in his woes from his having a partner in guilt, and that God too had changed His intention towards man (as justice demanded), whom He had fashioned and endowed with so much honour; there was need of the dispensation of a secret counsel so that the unchangeable God, whose will cannot be deprived of its own benignity, might perfect His first dispensation of kindness towards us by a more hidden mystery, and that man, who had been lured into guilt by the craftiness of diabolical wickedness, might not perish contrary to the purpose of God.

4. So then the Son of God enters upon this lower world, descending from His heavenly seat without retiring from the Father's glory, generated in a new order by a novel kind of birth. In a new order,—because He who is invisible in what belongs to Himself was made visible in what belongs to us, the Incomprehensible willed to be comprehended, He who continued to exist before time began to exist in time, the Lord of the universe took upon Him a servant's form shrouding the immensity of His majesty, the impassible God did not disdain to be passible man, nor the Immortal to be subject to the laws of death; and by a novel kind of birth,—because inviolate virginity, without knowing desire, furnished the material of the flesh. Nature it was that was taken by the Lord from His mother, not defect, and it does not follow in the case of our Lord Jesus Christ, born from the Virgin's womb, that because His nativity was wonderful His nature is therefore unlike ours. For the Selfsame who is very God is also very Man; and there is nothing false in this union, whilst the lowliness of the Manhood and the loftiness of the Divinity have their separate spheres. For as the Godhead is not changed by the compassion, so the Manhood is not absorbed by the dignity. For each nature performs what is proper to itself in communion with the other; the Word, that is, performing what is proper to the Word, and the flesh carrying out what is proper to the flesh. The one of these is brilliant with miracles, the other succumbs to injuries. And just as the Word does not retire from the Father's glory, so neither does the flesh abandon the nature of our race. For He is One and the Same—a fact which we must often insist upon—truly the Son of God, and truly the Son of Man. God, inasmuch as "In

the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God": Man, inasmuch as "The Word was made Flesh and dwelt amongst us"; God, inasmuch as "All things were made by Him, and without Him was nothing made": Man, inasmuch as "He was made of a woman, made under law." The birth of the flesh is a manifestation of the human nature, the Virgin's bringing-forth is a proof of the Divine Power. The infancy of the little Child is shown by His lowly cradle, the greatness of the Most High is declared by the voices of Angels. He whom Herod impiously tries to slay is like a human infant, but He whom the Magi are glad to humbly adore is the Lord of all. And even as early as the time when He came to the baptism of his forerunner John, lest He should escape notice because the Divinity was hidden by the veil of the flesh, the Father's voice spake in thunder from heaven, "This is My Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." And so He who as Man is tempted by the devil's craft is the Same that is ministered unto by angels as God. To feel hunger, thirst, and weariness, and to sleep, is evidently human; but to satisfy thousands of men with five loaves, and to bestow living water on the Samaritan woman, the drinking of which would cause her who drank it to thirst no more; to walk on the surface of the sea with feet which did not sink, and to allay the "rising billows" by rebuking the tempest, is without doubt Divine. As then, to omit many other examples, it does not belong to the same nature to weep in an emotion of pity for a dead friend, and to raise that same friend from the dead with a word of power, after the stone over the tomb where he had been for four days buried had been removed; or, to hang on the wood and, changing the light into darkness,

to make all the elements tremble; or, to be pierced with nails and to open the gates of Paradise to the faith of the robber;—so it does not belong to the same nature to say, "I and the Father are One," and "the Father is greater than I." For although in the Lord Jesus Christ there is One Person of God and man, yet that whence the suffering is common to both is one thing, and that whence the glory is common to both is another; for from us He has the Humanity inferior to the Father, and from the Father He has the Divinity equal to the Father.

5. It is on account of this Unity of Person which is to be understood as existing in both the Natures that, on the one hand, the Son of Man is read of as descending from heaven when the Son of God took flesh from the Virgin from whom He was born, and on the other hand that the Son of God is said to have been crucified and buried, although He suffered these things not in His Godhead itself, in virtue of which the Onlybegotten is both Co-eternal and Co-essential with the Father, but in the weakness of the Human Nature. And this is the reason why we all confess too in the Creed that "the Only-begotten Son of God was crucified and buried" in accordance with that saying of the Apostle, "For had they known they would not have crucified the Lord of Majesty." Now when our Lord and Saviour Himself was bringing out the faith of His disciples by His questions, He asked, "Who do men say that I the Son of Man am?" And when they had declared the different opinions of others, He said, "But ye, who say ye that I am?—I, that is, who am Son of Man, and whom in the form of a servant and in true flesh ye behold—who do ye say that I am?" Whereupon blessed Peter, being divinely inspired, and about to benefit all nations by his confession,

said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." And it was not without good reason that he was pronounced blessed by the Lord, and derived the firmness of his power and of his name from the original Rock, who confessed through the revelation of the Father that the Self-same Person was both the Son of God and the Christ. For one of these truths without the other would not profit unto salvation; and there was equal danger in believing the Lord Jesus Christ to be only God and not Man, or only Man and not God. But after the Lord's Resurrection (which surely was a resurrection of a true body, because there was no other body raised than that which had been crucified and died), for what other purpose did He stay on earth for forty days than to clear the integrity of our faith from all obscurity? For conversing with His disciples, and dwelling and eating with them, and allowing Himself to be handled with a loving and heedful touch by those whom doubt oppressed, it was on this account also that He entered in to His disciples when the doors were shut, and by His breath gave them the Holy Spirit, and, when He had given them the light of understanding, opened the hidden mysteries of the Holy Scriptures, and again, showed them the wound in His side, the marks of the nails, and the most recent signs of the passion, saying, "Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself. Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have"; it was on this account, I say, that the properties of the Divine and the Human Nature might be recognized as remaining in Him undivided, and that we might so know the Word to be not the same as the flesh as to confess the One Son of God to be both Word and Flesh. Which mystery of the faith this Eutyches must be deemed to have utterly failed

to grasp, for he hath not recognized our nature in the Onlybegotten of God, either in the humility of the mortality or in the glory of the resurrection. Nor hath he feared the sentence of the blessed apostle and evangelist John: "Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ come in flesh is of God, and every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God, and this is Antichrist." Now what is it to dissolve Jesus but to separate the human nature from Him, and to make void by the most shameless fictions the mystery whereby alone we have all been saved? Moreover, being in darkness as to the Body of Christ, he must necessarily show the same blindness and folly in relation to His Passion also. For if he does not think the cross of the Lord an unreality, and does not doubt that He underwent true punishment for the salvation of the world, let him acknowledge also the flesh of Him whose death he believes; and let him not deny that He whom he admits to have been passible was a man with a body like ours: for to deny the reality of His flesh is to deny also His sufferings in a body. If, then, he embraces the Christian faith and does not refuse to listen to the preaching of the Gospel, let him consider which nature it was that was pierced by the nails and hung upon the wood of the cross, and let him understand from which nature it was, when the side of the Crucified had been pierced by the soldier's spear, that the blood and the water flowed out, to invigorate the Church of God with the laver and with the cup. Let him also listen to the blessed apostle Peter declaring that "the sanctification of the Spirit" is wrought out through "the sprinkling of the blood of Christ"; and let him read attentively the words of the same apostle, "Knowing that ye were redeemed from your vain manner of life which ye in-

herited from your fathers, not with corruptible things as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Jesus Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot." Let him also not resist the testimony of the blessed apostle John, "And the blood of Jesus the Son of God cleanseth us from all sin." And again, "This is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith." And, "Who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is He that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not in water only, but in water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and the three are one." The Spirit of sanctification, namely; and the blood of redemption; and the water of baptism: which three are one and remain undivided, and not one of them is separated from its union with the others: because the Catholic Church lives and makes progress by this faith, that in Christ Jesus neither Humanity without true Divinity, nor Divinity without true Humanity, may be believed to exist.

6. When, however, Eutyches, in response to your cross-examination, said, "I confess that our Lord was from two Natures before the Union, but after the Union I admit but One Nature," I am amazed that so absurd and perverse a profession as this of his was not severely censured by the judges, and that an exceedingly foolish and blasphemous phrase was passed over, just as though nothing which could be matter of offence had been heard: since it is just as impious to say that the Only-begotten Son of God was from two Natures before the Incarnation, as to assert that after the Word was made Flesh but a single Nature remained in Him. But lest

Eutyches should think that his words were correct or tolerable because they were not silenced by any expression of opinion on your part, we exhort you to be carefully solicitous, dearly-beloved brother, that if by God's merciful inspiration the case is brought to a satisfactory conclusion, this short-sighted and inexperienced man may be purged also from this pestilent notion of his. For he, as the minutes of the Acts have made plain, had well begun to retreat from his opinion when, pressed by your judgment, he agreed to say what he had not said before, and to acquiesce in that faith to which he had formerly been a stranger. But when he refused to anathematize the impious doctrine, your Fraternity understood that he adhered to his false doctrine, and deserved to be condemned. For which if he is genuinely and efficaciously sorry, and recognizes, though late, how rightly the episcopal authority has been set in motion against him; or if for the fulfilment of expiation he shall condemn all his errors *viva voce* and by actual subscription, you cannot be blamed for showing him pity to any extent when he has been convinced of his error; for our Lord, the true and good Shepherd, who laid down His life for His sheep, and who came to save men's souls, not to destroy them, wishes us to imitate His loving affection; so that justice should indeed restrain sinners, but compassion should not repel those who have renounced their errors. For then indeed is the true faith defended most profitably when a false opinion is condemned by its actual former adherents.

But with a view to concluding the whole case religiously and faithfully, we have directed our brothers Julius the bishop and Renatus the presbyter and also my son Hilarus the deacon to act for us: and with them we have sent as companion Dulcitius our notary, of whose

fidelity we are assured; being confident that the help of God will be with you, so that he who has erred may be saved by condemning his depraved opinion.

May God keep you safe, dearest brother.

Given on the Ides of June, in the distinguished consulship of Asturius and Protogenes.

NOTE.—This translation, originally made for this work by my colleague and former pupil, the Rev. H. L. Bovell, B.A., has been compared with and revised by the published translations of Dr. Heurtley and Dr. Bright.

THE CHALCEDONIAN DEFINITION OF THE FAITH

§ 1. The Holy, Great, and Oecumenical Synod, by the grace of God and the command of our most orthodox and Christ-loving Emperors, Marcian and Valentinian Augusti, assembled in the metropolis of Chalcedon, in the Bithynian province, in the martyry of the holy and nobly triumphant martyr Euphemia, hath decreed as follows:—

§ 2. Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, confirming the knowledge of the Faith to His disciples, said, "My peace I leave with you, My peace I give to you," to the end that no one should differ from his neighbour in the doctrines of orthodoxy, but that the proclamation of the truth should be shown forth equally by all.

But since the evil one ceaseth not, by means of his own tares, to supplant the seeds of orthodoxy, and ever inventeth something new against the truth, therefore the Lord, in His wonted care for the human race, excited to zeal this orthodox and most faithful Emperor, and called together to Himself the chiefs of the priesthood from all parts, in order that, by the action of the grace of Christ the Lord of us all, we might remove every noxious element from the sheep of Christ, and enrich them with the fresh herbage of the truth.

And this, in fact, we have accomplished, having by a

unanimous vote driven away the dogmas of error, and having renewed the undeviating Creed of the Fathers, proclaiming to all the Symbol of the Three Hundred and Eighteen; and, in addition, accepting as our own fathers those who received that statement of orthodoxy—we mean the One Hundred and Fifty who subsequently met together in Great Constantinople, and themselves set their seal to the same Creed.

Therefore (preserving the order and all the decrees concerning the Faith passed by the Holy Synod held formerly at Ephesus, the leaders of which were Caelestine of Rome and Cyril of Alexandria of most holy memory) we decree that the exposition of the right and blameless Faith of the Three Hundred and Eighteen holy and blessed Fathers, assembled in Nicaea, in the time of the Emperor Constantine of orthodox memory, be pre-eminent; and moreover, that the definitions made by the One Hundred and Fifty holy Fathers in Constantinople, for the removal of the heresies then rife, and for the confirmation of the same Catholic and Apostolic Faith, remain valid.

The Symbol of the Three Hundred and Eighteen:*—

"We believe in One God the Father All-sovereign, Maker of all things visible and invisible:

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Begotten from the Father, Only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father; God from God, Light from Light, Very God from Very God; Begotten, not

* On the peculiarities of this recension see the notes on page 236. The additions are here printed in italics.

made; Co-essential with the Father; through Whom all things were made [both in heaven and in earth]; Who for us men and for our salvation came down *from the heavens*, and was incarnate *of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary*, and lived as Man; *was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, and* suffered, *and was buried*, and rose the third day *according to the Scriptures, and* ascended into the heavens; *and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and again* cometh *with glory* to judge the quick and the dead, *of Whose kingdom there shall be no end:*

"And in the Spirit, Holy, *Sovereign, and Life-giving.*

"But those who say, 'Once He was not,' and 'Before He was begotten He was not,' and that 'He was made out of nothing,' or who say that 'the Son of God is of a different Hypostasis or Essence,' or 'mutable' or 'changeable'; these the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes."

The Symbol of the One Hundred and Fifty:—

"We believe in One God the Father All-sovereign, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible:

"And in One Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of the Father before all worlds; Light from Light, Very God from Very God; Begotten, not made; Co-essential with the Father; through Whom all things were made; Who for us men and for our salvation came down from the

heavens, and was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and lived as Man; was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried and rose the third day according to the Scriptures; and ascended into the heavens, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and cometh again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, of Whose kingdom there shall be no end:

"And in the Spirit, Holy, Sovereign, and Life-giving, Who proceedeth from the Father; Who with the Father and the Son is together worshipped and glorified; Who spake by the prophets:

"In One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church:

"We acknowledge One Baptism for the remission of sins:

"We look for a Resurrection of the dead, and a Life of the world to come. Amen."

§ 3. Although this wise and saving Symbol of the Divine Grace would have been sufficient for complete knowledge and confirmation of orthodoxy, for it both teaches the perfect doctrine concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and sets forth the Incarnation of the Lord to those who receive it faithfully; yet, forasmuch as those who attempt to set aside the preaching of the truth have produced foolish utterances through their own heresies,—some daring to corrupt the mystery of the Lord's Incarnation for us, and denying the title "Theotokos" to the Virgin; others introducing a confusion and mixture, shamelessly imagining too the Nature

of the flesh and of the Godhead to be one, and absurdly maintaining that the Divine Nature of the Only-begotten is by this confusion passible;—therefore the present Holy, Great, and Oecumenical Synod, being minded to exclude all their machinations against the truth, and affirming the doctrine as unchangeable from the first, hath decreed primarily that the Creed of the Three Hundred and Eighteen holy Fathers should remain inviolate; and, on account of those who contend against the Holy Spirit, it ratifies the teaching subsequently set forth by the One Hundred and Fifty holy Fathers assembled in the imperial city concerning the essence of the Spirit, which they made known to all, not as adducing anything left lacking by their predecessors, but making distinct by scriptural testimonies their conception concerning the Holy Spirit against those who were trying to set aside His Sovereignty; and, on account of those who attempt to corrupt the mystery of the Incarnation, and who shamelessly pretend that He who was born of the holy Mary was a mere man, it hath received the Synodical Epistles of the blessed Cyril, Pastor of the Church of Alexandria, to Nestorius and to the Easterns, as being agreeable thereto, for the refutation of the wild notions of Nestorius and for the instruction of those who in pious zeal desire to understand the saving Symbol. To these also it hath suitably united, for the confirmation of the right doctrines, the Epistle of the Prelate of the great and older Rome, the most blessed and most holy Archbishop Leo, which was written to the saintly Archbishop Flavian for the exclusion of the wrong opinion of Eutyches, inasmuch as it agrees with the confession of the great Peter, and is a common pillar against the heterodox.

§ 4. For the Synod opposes those who presume to rend the mystery of the Incarnation into a Duality of Sons; and it expels from the company of the priests those who dare to say that the Godhead of the Only-begotten is passible, and it withstands those who imagine a mixture or confusion of the Two Natures of Christ, and it drives away those who fancy that the form of a servant, taken by Him of us, is of a heavenly or any other essence; and it anathematizes those who imagine Two Natures of the Lord before the Union, but fashion anew One Nature after the Union. Following, then, the holy Fathers, we all unanimously teach that our Lord Jesus Christ is to us One and the same Son, the Self-same Perfect in Godhead, the Self-same Perfect in Manhood; truly God and truly Man; the Self-same of a rational soul and body; co-essential with the Father according to the Godhead, the Self-same co-essential with us according to the Manhood; like us in all things, sin apart; before the ages begotten of the Father as to the Godhead, but in the last days, the Self-same, for us and for our salvation (born) of Mary the Virgin Theotokos as to the Manhood; One and the Same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten; acknowledged in Two Natures unconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the difference of the Natures being in no way removed because of the Union, but rather the properties of each Nature being preserved, and (both) concurring into One Person and One Hypostasis; not as though He were parted or divided into Two Persons, but One and the Self-same Son and Only-begotten God, Word, Lord, Jesus Christ; even as from the beginning the prophets have taught concerning Him, and as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself hath taught us, and as the Symbol of the Fathers hath handed down to us.

§ 5. These things having been defined by us with all possible accuracy and care, the Holy and Oecumenical Synod hath decreed that it is unlawful for any one to present, write, compose, devise, or teach to others any other Creed; but that those who dare either to compose another Creed, or to bring forward or teach or deliver another Symbol to those wishing to turn to the full knowledge of the truth from Paganism or from Judaism, or from heresy of any kind whatsoever,—that such persons, if bishops or clerics, shall be deposed, the bishops from the episcopate and clerics from the clerical office, and, if monks or laics, they shall be anathematized.

INDICES

GENERAL INDEX

Aachen, council of (809), 90.
Acacius, Homoion creed of, 3, 28.
"Accidental" Union, 110.
Adoptionism, 111.
Advent, the Second, 44 f.
Aetius of Constantinople, 74, 211, 213.
African baptismal creed, 4.
Alexander of Alexandria, 13, 50, 135, 211.
Alexandria, council of (321), 13.
,, ,, (324), 14.
,, ,, (362), 52, 109.
,, ,, (430), 116.
,, creed of, 59.
"Almighty," 23.
Ambrose, 134, 211.
Amphilochius, 211.
Anabaptists, 8, 208.
Anastasius, 99.
Anathematisms of Nicaea, 18, 47 ff.
,, of Cyril, 143.
,, of Fifth General Council, 154, 179 ff.
Anatolius, 221.
Andrew of Samosata, 143, 160.
anima animans, 109.
,, rationalis, 109.
Anomaeans, 51.
Antidosis, 112.
Antioch, creeds of, 17, 63 ff.
,, council of (269), 27, 63.
,, anti-Cyrilline council and articles, 162.
apocrisiarius, 222.
Apollinarianism, 40, 108.
,, condemned at Alexandria, 109.
,, Cyril accused of, 157, 159.
Apollinarianism, Valentinian, 208.
Apollinarius, 2, 5 f.
,, Docetic, 8.
,, his heresy, 108 f.
Apostolic Constitutions, creed of, 61 f.
Apostolical tradition, 5.
Aquileian creed, 41 f., 86.
Aretaeus, 38.
Arianism, 2, 5 f.
,, rise of, 13 f.
,, Docetic, 8.
,, rationalistic, 49 f.
,, illogical, 53.
,, pagan, 53.
,, Cyril accused of, 158.
Arius, 2, 13 f., 49 f.
Armenian creed, 39, 48.
,, Church, 240 f.
Articles, Cyril's Twelve, 143 ff.
,, XLII. (1552), 208.
Ascension, the, 43 f.
Athanasius of Anazarbus, 54.
Athanasius, anticipated heresies, 9, 111.
,, at Nicaea, 15.
,, on the 3 days' burial, 43.
,, letter to Epictetus, 109, 162, 172, 175.
,, on the perpetual virginity, 208.
,, on the "subordination," 211.
Atonement, the, 36, 158 f.
Atticus of Nicopolis, 223.
Augustine of Canterbury, 90.
Augustine on the perpetual virginity, 208.
,, on the "subordination," 211, 212.
Ἅγιον, τό, 76.

ἀδιαιρέτως, 241.
ἀειπαρθένος, 208.
ἀνάστασις σαρκός, 85 f.
ἀνθρωποπρεπῶς, 128, 211.
ἄνθρωπος, 209.
ἀνθρωποτόκος, 114, 160.
ἀντίδοσις, 112.
ἀποστολική, 84.
ἀποφαίνειν, 265.
ἀσυγχύτως, 241.
ἀτρεπτόν, 31 f., 174.
ἀτρέπτως, 241.
ἄφεσις, 85.
ἀχωρίστως, 241.

Baeda, 222.
Baptism, one, 84 f.
Baptismal formula, 2.
,, interrogations, 3 f.
,, creed of Jerusalem, 4.
,, ,, Cyprian, 4.
Basil wrongly quoted by Theodoret, 150.
,, on inviolability of Nicene creed, 175.
Basil of Seleucia, 191.
Basil, Roman legate, 222.
Benedict VIII., 90.
Bigg, Dr., 34.
"Blasphemies" of Arius, 28, 54.
Body, Apollinarian views of Christ's, 108.
Body, identity of resurrection, 86.
Boniface, Roman legate, 222.
Bornemann, Prof., 60.
Braga, first council of, 88.
"Brethren" of our Lord, 208 f.
Bright, Dr., 8, 44, 140, 153.
Bruce, Michael, 44.
Burial, the, 41.
Byrom, J., 135.

Caelestine, Pope, 100, 116, 134.
Caesarea, creed of, 3, 15, 30, 34, 57.
Canon of Truth, 5.
Cassian, 67 f., 100 f.
Catechetical instruction, 5.
Cerinthian separation, 214.
Chalcedon, council of, 48, 73, 222 ff.
,, Definition of Faith, 224.
Christ our High Priest, 156.
Christ's Person Divine, 112.
Christological heresies, 6 f.
Christmas Sequence, 135.
,, Preface, 208.
Chrysippus, 136.
Chrysostom, 211.
Church, the, in early creeds, 80.
,, ,, notes of, 81 ff.
Church Quarterly Review, 8, 83, 92.
Communicatio idiomatum, 112, 135, 193, 201, 212.
Communion of Saints, 82.
Constantine, 18.
Constantinople, local creed of, 17, 236.
,, council of (381), 70, 74 ff.
,, home synod (448), 189 f.
,, council of (553), 154, 179 ff., (681), 241, 247 f.
contesseratio, 205.
Coptic Jacobites, liturgy of, 242.
Cos, 222.
Creation, doctrine of, 25, 35.
Creed, names of the, 206.
Creeds, local, 4, 16.
,, conciliar, 20.
,, liturgical, 20, 90, 137.
Cyprian, baptismal interrogatories, 4.
Cyril of Jerusalem, baptismal creed of, 4.
,, ,, catechetical lectures of, 5.
,, ,, revised creed of, 70 ff.
Cyril of Alexandria, anticipates heresies, 9.
,, ,, on the reality of the Incarnation, 42.
,, ,, on the Double Procession, 91, 141, 155.
,, ,, argument from the Eucharist, 138.
,, ,, Twelve Articles, 143 ff.
,, ,, accused of Arianism, 158.

Cyril of Alexandria accused of Apollinarianism, 157, 174.
" " Epistles at Ephesus, 160.
" " Epistles at Chalcedon, 160, 237.
" " his reading of John iii. 13, 174.
" " his reading of 1 Cor. xv. 47, 174.
" " on inviolability of Nicene creed, 171, 175.
" " on the "subordination," 211.

Damasus, 134.
Dated creed, 28, 41.
Death, Christ's real, 42
Dedication creed, 28, 63 ff.
Dei genetrix, 114.
Deipara, 113.
Denke, John, 8.
Diogenes of Cyzicus, 236.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 31, 33.
Dionysius of Rome, 31, 49.
Dioscorus, 192, 219 ff.
Dorylaeum, *see* Eusebius of.
Docetism, 6, 8, 10, 213.
Duad of Sons, 110.

Ecclesia, 81.
Ephesus, council of (431), 48, 160, 192, 242.
" synodal letter, 161.
" Latrocinium, 219 ff.
Epictetus, Athanasius' Epistle to, 109, 162, 172, 175.
Epiphanius, on the Trinity, 3.
" creeds of, 17, 71, 93 f.
" "Ancoratus," 71 f.
essentia, 52.
Eternal life, 86 f.
Eucharist, the Holy, Trinitarian argument from, 27.
" " Christological argument from, 138 f.
Eucharist, the Holy, Creed recited at, 137.
Euphemia, St., 222, 235.
Eusebius of Caesarea, creed of, 3, 15.
" " on Nicene anathema, 51 f.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, creed of, 15.
" " rejected *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*, 30, 51.
Eusebius of Dorylaeum, 67, 99, 189.
Eustathius, 28.
Eutyches, 2, 5 f.
" revived Apollinarianism, 108, 173, 208.
" charged with heresy, 189.
" rebuked in the Tome, 195, 203.
Eutychianism, 241.
Evagrius, 223, 235, 240.
Evangelistic sayings, twofold reference of, 139.
ex duabus naturis, 203.
Exouchontians, 51.
ἐκ δύο φύσεων, 190, 194, 203, 224, 238.
ἐκκλησία, 81.
ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, 224, 238, 240.
ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν, 110, 147.
ἕνωσις σχετική, 110.
ἑτέρα πίστις, 242.

Fatherhood of God, 23, 49.
Fifth General Council, 154, 179 ff., 237.
Filioque, 88 ff.
Flavian of Constantinople, 190 ff., 220 f., 224, 237 f.
"Flesh" = man, 158.
Fleury, Hist. Eccl., 153, 190, 221.
Florentius, 191.
"Form of God," *see μορφὴ Θεοῦ*.
Formulary of Reunion, 150, 162 ff., 167 f., 173.
frustratorie, 207.

Galen, 38.
Gelasius, 19.
Genealogy of Christ, argument from, 207.
Generation, Eternal, of the Son, 26 f., 30, 49 f.

Gnosticism, dualistic, 24.
,, rejected Incarnation and Sacraments, 9.
,, rejected unity of God, 22.
Gospel sayings respecting Christ, 139.
Gregory, deacon, 222.
,, pope, 90.
Gregory of Nyssa, 75.
Guardian, *The*, 209.
Gwatkin, Prof., 63.

Hades, descent into, 41.
Haethfelth, council of, 90.
Hardwick, on Articles, 8, 208.
Heresy, character of, 7 f.
High priesthood of Christ, 128, 156.
Hilarus, 192, 204, 215, 219 f.
Hilary of Poitiers, 27, 33, 89, 134, 139, 211.
Holy Spirit, One, 47.
,, ὁμοούσιον, 77 f.
,, Procession of, 78.
,, temporal mission of, 79.
,, Double Procession of, 88 ff., 141.
,, Christ's Own, 91, 155.
"Home Synod," 189 f., 192, 214, 219.
homo, 209.
Homoiousians, 28.
Hooker, Eccles. Pol., 113, 241 f.
Hort, Dr., 29, 70 ff., 80 f.
Hosius, 14.
Hymnody, dogmatic, 79 f.
Hypostatic Union, 110, 139, 147, 158 f., 212.

Identity of the Body, 86.
,, ,, Person, 86.
Ignatius, anticipated heresies, 9.
Immortality of the Soul, 86.
Incarnation, rejected by Gnostics, 9.
,, mode of, 39.
,, mysteriousness of, 112.
incomprehensibilis, 210.
indicium, 205.
indiscretam, 206.
Institution of a Christian Man, 208.
Integrity of Christ's Two Natures, 111.
ἰδιοποιεῖν, 137.
Ἰησοῦς, 26.

Jerusalem, baptismal creed, 4.
,, early creed, 58.
,, revised creed, 17, 26, 69 ff.
John of Antioch, 160, 162 f.
,, ,, Cyril's Epistle to, 166 ff.
John, Count, 162.
Julian of Cos, 215, 222.
Julius of Puteoli, 192, 204, 215.
Justin Martyr, 6, 34.
,, creed of, 60.

Karl the Great, 89.
"Kenosis," the, 37, 135, 140.
Kingdom, eternity of Christ's, 45 f.
καθολική, 83 f.
κατ' εὐδοκίαν, 111.
κένωσις, 37, 135, 140.
κρᾶσις, 136, 174.
κύριον, τό, 77.
Κύριος, 25.

"Laetentur caeli," 163.
Laodicaea, council of, 48.
Latrocinium, the, 220 ff.
Leo the Great, 138.
,, Tome of, 189 ff.
,, on the "Rock," 212.
Leo III., 89.
lex adorandi lex credendi, 79.
Lightfoot, Dr., 84, 175, 209.
Liturgical use of creed, 20, 90, 137.
Logos, Arian view of the, 8, 31.
,, Apollinarian view of the, 8.
,, Marcellian ,, 45 f.
,, Theodore's ,, 111.
Lucentius, 222.
Lucian, creed of, 63 ff.

Macedonianism, 5 f., 16, 237.
Manes, 191.
Manichaeism, 10.
Marcellus, 16, 45 f.
Marcian, 221 f.
Marcion, 80.
Marius Mercator, 99 f., 144 ff., 153.

Martha, 26.
Martial, 14.
martyry, 235.
Mary, perpetual virginity of, 208 f.
,, *see* Theotokos.
Mason, Prof., 35, 77.
Mater Dei, 113.
Mayor, J. B., Dr., 209.
Meletian schism in Aegypt, 14.
mendacium, 210.
Monarchia, 7, 9.
Monophysitism, 159, 241.
Monothelitism, 241.
Mozarabic liturgy, 86.
μάθημα, 206.
μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη, 140 f., 192.
μίξις, 136.
μοναρχία, 7.
μονογενής, 27 f.
μορφὴ Θεοῦ, μορφὴ δούλου, 115, 145, 151 f., 158.
μυστήριον, 210.

Nathanael, 26.
natura, 52 f., 148.
Neale, Dr., 89 f., 221.
Necessary Doctrine and Erudition, 208.
Nestorian controversy, 99 f.
Nestorius, 2, 5 f., 99, 236.
,, Pelagian, 8.
,, Sabellian, 8.
,, misconception of Θεοτόκος, 112.
,, dicta of, 110, 137.
,, counter-anathemas, 160.
Nicaea, council of (325), 14 ff.
,, ,, (451), 222.
,, creed of, 17.
,, anathemas of, 47 f.
,, fathers of, 235 f.
Nicene Creed, expansion of baptismal formula, 3.
,, not originally a "symbol," 48, 242.
,, supplanted by "Constantinopolitan," 76, 138, 243.
,, inviolable, 171, 175.
,, at Chalcedon, 223, 236.
,, made a baptismal "symbol," 242.
Nicé, Fraud of, 28, 41.
Nicetas of Remesiana, 86.
Nicholas I., 90.
Nicomedia, *see* Eusebius of.
Novatian controversy, 4.
νοῦς, 108.

Omnipotens, 23.
Origen, his use of *ὁμοούσιον*, 34.
,, on the Eternal Generation. 49.
,, on Θεοτόκος, 114.
,, on the "subordination," 211.
ordo, 205.
Osiander, 36.
Ottley, Mr., 30, 241.
οἰκειοῦσθαι, 137.
οἰκονομία, 174.
οἰκονομικῶς, 142.
ὁμοούσιον discussed at Alexandria, 14.
,, adopted at Nicaea, 32.
,, rejected by Eusebius and Arius, 32.
,, at Antioch (269), 33.
,, in formulary of reunion, 168, 173.
ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν, 168, 173, 190 f., 207, 239.
οὐσία, 14, 34, 51.

Pamphilus, 34.
Paschal Question, 14.
Paschasinus, 222.
Passion, mode of the, 40.
Patripassianism, 158 f.
Paul of Emisa, 162, 166.
Paul of Samosata, 27, 33, 112.
Pelagianism, 8, 10.
persona, 52, 148.
Person of Christ Divine, 112.
Personal Union, 110, 139, 147, 158 f.
Personal Identity, 86.
Peter the Fuller, 138.
Peter, St., 201, 212.
petra, 212.
pietas, 210.
Pneumatomachi, 237.
Pontius Pilate, 40 f.

praevaricator, 210.
Pre-existence of Christ's Manhood, 8, 214 f.
Primasius, 43.
principatus Patris, 211.
Priscillianists, 8, 10.
Procession, the Double, 78, 88 ff., 141.
Proclus of Cyzicus, 135.
Proper Preface for Christmas, 208.
Psilanthropism, 6, 213.
Ptolemaeus, 30.
Pulcheria, 221.
Puller, F. W., 82.
Pusey, Dr., 91 f.
Pusey, P. E., 153.
παντοκράτωρ, 23.
παράθεσις, 136.
πηγὴ θεότητος, 211.
πιστεύομεν, 20.
πιστεύομεν εἰς, 21.
πίστις, 21, 206.
προσθεῖναι, 173.
πρόσωπον, 52, 141.
,, = *ὑπόστασις*, 149.
φυσική, 148.
φυσιολογεῖν, 191.
φύσις, 52, 140 f.
φῶς, 30 f.

Quicumque, The, 211.

Reccared, King, 88.
redditio symboli, 206.
Regula fidei, 5.
Renatus, 192, 204, 215.
resurrectio carnis, 85 f.
Resurrection of the Body, 42, 85 f.
,, ,, rejected by Priscillianists, 10.
Reunion, Formulary of, 150, 162 ff., 167 f., 173.
Reverence, false, 9.
Robertson, Principal, 140.
Rock, Christ or Peter, the, 212.
Rome, council of (430), 116, 134.
Routh, Dr., 235, 240.
Ruffinus, 22, 205.
Rule of Faith, 5, 16.
ῥευστόν, 72.

Sabellianism, 2, 6 f., 13, 150, 159.
Sacramental union, 139.
sacramentum, 210.
Sacraments rejected by Gnostics, 9.
sanctorum communio, 82.
sanguis et aqua, 213.
sapere, 205.
Sardica, council of, 73.
Scotist view of Incarnation, 36.
Session at Right Hand, the, 43 f.
Seleucia, 3, 28, 38.
signum, 205.
Sirmium, first creed of, 110.
,, second creed of, 3.
Sisinnius, 99.
Sixth General Council, 241, 247 f.
solvere Jesum, 202, 213.
Sonship, Divine, 26.
Sotades, 14.
Spirit, Holy, *see* Holy Spirit.
Stoic philosophical terms, 34, 136.
"Subordination," the, 211.
substantia, 34, 52.
Swainson, Dr., 73, 137.
Swete, Dr., 89, 91 f.
symbolum, 4, 205 f.
syncellus, 99.
σαρκικῶς = κατὰ σάρκα, 146.
σάρξ, 109, 158.
σαρκόομαι, 38.
συμβολή, 205 f.
σύμβολον, 205 f.
σύγχυσις, 136, 174.
συνάφεια, 110, 136.
σύνοδος, 147.
σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα, 190.
συντοχία, 273.
σχέσεις, 136.
σχετική, 110, 136, 148.
σῶμα, 34.

Tacitus, 41.
Tarasius of Constantinople, 90.
Tertullian, on baptismal profession, 4.
,, on the Trinity, 78.
,, on the Double Procession, 89.
,, on distinction of Natures in Christ, 111.
,, on the "subordination," 211.
,, anticipated heresies, 9, 34.

Tertullian, use of Θεολογία, 175.
" " contesseratio, 205.
Thalia, 14, 32, 37, 51, 54.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 99, 111.
Theodoret, 139, 143, 160.
Theodosius II., 116, 161, 173, 192.
Theognostus, 30.
Theopaschite language, 159.
Theotokos, 8, 99 f., 160.
Timothy of Constantinople, 138.
titulus, 215.
Toledo, council of (447), 89.
" " (589), 88, 138.
Tombe, Michael, 208.
Tome of Leo, 192, 193 f., 195 ff.
Trinitarian heresies, 6 f.
Trinity, doctrine of the Holy, 2, 5, 78 f.
" "common" actions of the, 155.
" "subordination" in the, 211.
Θεοδόχος, 114.
θεολογία, 175.
θεοπρεπεῖς, 211.
Θεοτόκος, 99, 112 f.
θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος, 150.
ΤΙΗ, 236.
τρεπτόν, 54, 108.
τριάς, 3.

Unicus, 28.
Unigenitus, 28.
Union of body and soul, analogy of, 136.
Union of the Logos with Jesus, "accidental," 110, 136.
Union of the Logos with Jesus, "moral," 111.
Unity of God, 22.
ὕλη, 34.
ὑπόστασις, 14.
" =οὐσία at Nicaea, 51 f.
" =προσωπον with Cyril, 149.
" in N.T., 52, 141.
ὑποτύπωσις, 2.

Valentinianism, 40, 208.
Valentinian III., 173.
Valentinus, 191.
Vigilius of Thapsus, 4.
Virginity, perpetual, of Mary, 208 f.
vita aeterna, 87.
Vulgate readings, 207, 213, 214.

Water and blood, symbolism of, 213 f.
Wesley, Charles, 135.
Westcott, Dr., 36, 211.

Χριστός, 26.
Χριστοτόκος, 114, 160.
Χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, 95, 239.

Zahn, Dr., 82, 86.
Ζωή, 87.
Ζωοποιόν, 77.

INDEX OF TEXTS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO

Genesis. PAGE

iii. 16 . . . 130
xii. 3 . . . 197
xiv. 4 . . . 236
xxii. 18 . . . 197

Exodus.

iii. 14 . . . 25

Leviticus.

xi. 44 f. . . . 76
xxv. 10 . . . 85

Deuteronomy.

iv. 35 . . . 22
vi. 4 . . . 22
xv. 1 . . . 85

1 Samuel.

ii. 30 . . . 166

2 Samuel.

v. 10 . . . 23
vii. 8, 26 . . . 23

1 Kings.

ii. 19 . . . 43

Job.

v. 17 . . . 23
viii. 5 . . . 23

Psalms.

xvi. 10 . . . 42
,, 11 . . . 43
xxxiv. 9 . . . 25

Psalms—*contd.* PAGE

xxxv. 4 . . . 195
xl. 6 ff. . . . 129
xcii. 3 . . . 200
xcv. 11 . . . 166
cx. 1 . . . 43

Proverbs.

viii. 22 . . . 15
ix. 1 . . . 197
xxii. 28 . . . 171

Isaiah.

vi. 2 . . . 79
vii. 14 . 151, 169, 197
ix. 6 . . . 197
xxv. 8 . . 130, 142
xxvi. 12 . . . 167
xliv. 6, 8 . . . 22
xlix. 3 ff. . . . 151
l. 6 . . . 170

Hosea.

vi. 2 . . . 42

Joel.

ii. 32 . . . 25

Malachi.

iii. 6 . 124, 135, 170

Matthew.

i. 1 . . . 196
,, 20 . . 26, 40
,, 21 . . 26, 169
,, 23 . 145, 169, 197
iii. 11 . . . 84

Matthew—*contd.* PAGE

iii. 17 . . . 200
v. 48 . . . 76
vi. 12 . . . 85
x. 20 . . 91, 171
,, 28 . . . 86
,, 34 f. . . . 121
,, 37 . . . 121
xii. 28 . . . 155
,, 32 . . . 87
xvi. 13 ff. . . . 201
,, 23 . . . 205
,, 27 . . . 45
xviii. 6 . . . 104
xix. 17 . . . 15
xx. 18 f. . . . 149
,, 23 . . . 15
xxiv. 30 . . . 45
,, 36 . . . 149
xxv. 31 . . . 45
xxvi. 39 . . . 149
,, 64 . . . 43
xxvii. 48 . . . 149
xxviii. 19 . . 2 f., 79
,, 20 . . . 91

Mark.

i. 4 . . . 84
viii. 33 . . . 205
,, 38 . . . 45
x. 33 . . . 42
xiii. 11 . . . 80
,, 22 . . . 149
,, 26 . . . 45
,, 32 . . . 15

Luke.

i. 2 . . . 122
,, 31 . . 26, 169
,, 33 . . . 45
,, 35 . 26, 40, 197
,, 43 . . . 113
ii. 11 . . . 25
,, 21 . . . 26
,, 32 . . . 26
,, 33 . . . 209
,, 48 . . . 209
,, 52 . . . 15
ix. 26 . . . 45
,, 56 . . . 204
xviii. 30 . . . 87

Luke—*contd.* PAGE

xix. 10 . . . 37
xx. 34 f. . . . 87
xxi. 27 . . . 45
xxiv. 39 . . 86, 202
,, 46 . . . 42
,, 51 . . . 43

John.

i. 1 . 30, 130, 199
,, 3 . . 34, 199
,, 14—107, 125, 131, 145, 158, 197, 199, 203
,, 18 . . . 29
,, 41 . . . 26
,, 49 . . . 26
ii. 2 . . . 131
,, 19 . . 42, 153
iii. 4 . . . 85
,, 13 . 112, 169, 174
,, 16 f. . . . 37
,, 34 . . 125, 135
iv. 25 . . . 26
v. 17 . . . 35
,, 19 . . . 15
,, 20 . . . 31
,, 26 . . . 30
vi. 29 f. . . . 22
,, 53 . . . 127
,, 63 . . . 77
viii. 26 . . . 149
,, 35 . . 124, 135
,, 40 . . . 128
,, 42 . . . 30
,, 58 . . . 25
x. 15 . . . 204
,, 30 15, 124, 128, 135, 200
xi. 27 . . . 26
,, 35 . . . 126
xii. 27 . . . 149
,, 47 . . . 37
xiv. 1 . . . 25
,, 6 . . . 130
,, 9 . . 91, 128
,, 16 f. . . . 91
,, 26 . . . 76
,, 27 . . 167, 229
,, 28 . 15, 200, 211
xv. 15 . . . 151
,, 26 78, 91, 130, 155, 171
xvi. 14 . . 91, 129 f.

John—*contd.* PAGE

xvi. 15 . . . 149
,, 28 . . . 30
xvii. 3 . . . 87
,, 5, 24 . . . 26
xix. 34 . . 202, 213
xx. 17 . . 23, 126
,, 21 . . . 84
,, 23 . . . 91
,, 31 . . . 26

Acts.

i. 9 . . . 43
ii. 36 . . . 15
,, 38 . . . 85
,, 41 f. . . . 82
iii. 13 . . . 40
iv. 27 . . . 40
vii. 38 . . . 81
,, 56 . . . 43
ix. 32 . . . 83
x. 36 . . . 25
,, 43 . . . 22
xvi. 7 . . . 171
,, 17 . . . 91
,, 31 . . . 22
xvii. 31 . . 45, 127
xix. 4 . . . 84
xx. 28 . . . 112
xxvi. 27 . . . 22
xxvii. 25 . . . 22

Romans.

i. 1 f. . . . 196
,, 3 . . . 207
ii. 16 . . . 45
,, 25 . . . 210
iii. 14 . . . 104
,, 23 . . . 129
viii. 3 . . 36, 239
,, 8 f. . . . 171
,, 9 f. . . . 91
,, 15 . . . 23
,, 34 . . . 43
x. 9 ff. . . . 25
xv. 8 ff. . . . 26

1 Corinthians.

ii. 8 . . . 201
,, 12 . . 78, 91
vi. 17 . . . 125

1 Corinthians—*contd.* PAGE

viii. 4 ff. . . . 22 f.
,, 6 23, 25, 34, 128, 170, 174
xi. 8 . . . 112
,, 26 . . 127, 137
xii. 13 . . . 47
xiii. 9 . . . 87
xv. 3 . . . 41
,, 4 . . . 42
,, 20 . . . 126
,, 21 . . 85, 127
,, 24 . . . 46
,, 25 . . . 43
,, 28 . . . 15
,, 36 . . . 86
,, 47 . 112, 169 f.
,, 54 . . . 142

2 Corinthians.

iii. 6 . . . 77
,, 17 f. . . . 77
iv. 4 . . . 128
v. 21 . . 133, 145
vi. 18 . . . 23
ix. 4 . . . 52
xi. 17 . . . 52
xiii. 4 . . . 79
,, 5 . . . 105

Galatians.

ii. 16 . . . 22
,, 18 . . . 210
iii. 13 . . . 145
,, 16 . . . 197
iv. 4 . . . 199 f.
,, 5 . . . 126
,, 6 . . . 91
,, 7 . . . 151

Ephesians.

i. 7 . . . 85
,, 19 f. . . . 152
,, 20 . . . 43
ii. 14 . . . 166
,, 20 . . . 84
iii. 15 . . . 23
iv. 4 ff. . . 47, 82, 84
,, 5 . . . 168
,, 6 . . 22 f., 35
,, 9 . . . 210
,, 10 . . . 43
v. 2 . . 129, 131

Philippians. PAGE

i. 19 . . . 91
,, 29 . . . 22
ii. 6 ff. . . 115, 145
,, 7 . 15, 37, 169

Colossians.

i. 14 . . . 85
,, 15 . . 15, 128
,, 16 . . . 34 f.
,, 18 . . 126, 133
ii. 9 . . 125, 150
iii. 1 . . . 43

1 Thessalonians.

ii. 19 . . . 45
v. 4 . . . 45

1 Timothy.

i. 17 . . . 24
ii. 5 . . . 128
v. 21 . . . 107
vi. 13 . . . 40

2 Timothy.

iv. 1 . . . 45

Hebrews.

i. 1 . . . 80
,, 3 . 15, 30, 43, 52
,, 5 . . . 26
ii. 9 . 106, 126, 133
,, 14 . . 107, 131
iii. 1 . . 128, 132
iv. 15 . . 233, 239
v. 1 ff. . . . 44
vi. 1 . . . 76
,, 2 . . . 85
vii. 25 . . . 44
,, 26 . . . 43
viii. 1 . . . 43
x. 5 ff. . . . 129
,, 12 . . . 43
xi. 1 . . 21, 52
,, 3 . . . 25

Hebrews—*contd.* PAGE

xi. 27 . . . 21
,, 35 . . . 122
xii. 2 . . . 43

James.

i. 17 . . . 170

1 Peter.

i. 8 . . . 22
,, 11 . . . 91
,, 15 . . . 76
,, 18 . . 203, 214
ii. 3 . . . 25
iii. 22 . . . 43
iv. 1 . . 126, 170
,, 5 . . . 44

2 Peter.

i. 21 . . . 80
iii. 12 . . . 85

1 John.

i. 7 . . . 203
ii. 1 . . . 44
iii. 1 . . . 23
,, 2 . . . 87
iv. 2 f. . . . 202
,, 3 . . . 213
v. 4 ff. . . . 203
,, 8 . . . 214
,, 10 . . . 22
,, 20 . . . 87

Jude.

3 . . . 83

Revelation.

iii. 14 . . . 35
,, 21 . . . 44
iv. 1 ff. . . . 79
,, 11 . . . 35
vii. 17 . . . 130
xx. 12 . . . 45
xxii. 13 . . . 35

PLYMOUTH
W. BRENDON AND SON
PRINTERS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

TERTULLIANI

DE PRAESCRIPTIONE HAERETICORUM: AD MARTYRAS: AD SCAPULAM.

Edited, with Introductions and Notes.

(Clarendon Press, 1893.)

Spectator, *April 28th*, 1894.—"We should like to see this little volume made a text-book for candidates for Holy Orders."

Critical Review, *October*, 1894.—"The book is an excellent piece of work."

Expositor, *July*, 1894.—"The notes are excellent, and precisely what a student needs."

Athenæum, *July 14th*, 1894.—"The book deserves the warmest welcome . . . its merits are great, and it is calculated to be most useful to students of Tertullian."

Saturday Review, *December 15th*, 1894.—"Mr. Bindley's work is highly praiseworthy, both for its finish and its self-restraint. He gives the reader all that is necessary, and not a word more."

New York Churchman, *March 17th*, 1894.—"No Latin is in greater need of annotation than Tertullian's, and the work here is well done. . . . This edition is precisely adapted to introduce students to his crabbed and rather exasperating style."

TERTULLIANI

APOLOGETICUS ADVERSUS GENTES PRO CHRISTIANIS.

Edited, with Introduction and Notes.

(Clarendon Press, 1889.)

Spectator, *September 28th*, 1889.—"We welcome this scholarly edition with especial pleasure. The work might advantageously be recommended to candidates for Holy Orders by the Bishops' Examining Chaplains, for it contains within a brief compass much that is valuable on questions of dogmatics, apologetics, and early Church history. The plan and execution of this edition are both good, the annotations being an advance upon anything of the kind we have seen in English."

Saturday Review, *November 9th*, 1889.—"We have to thank Mr. Bindley for a good edition of one of the most interesting documents of the early Church. Mr. Bindley has read up his subject thoroughly, and gives the results of his studies in a compact and serviceable form. Language, doctrine, ritual, and archæology have, each and all, received due attention, and for examination purposes nothing more could be desired."

Church Quarterly Review, *April*, 1890.—"Mr. Bindley has performed a very considerable service for theological students. The notes are full and to the point; they explain the drift of the argument, and they illustrate the meaning of the author."

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE APOLOGY OF TERTULLIAN.

Translated, with Introduction, Analysis, and an Appendix the Letters of Pliny and Trajan respecting the Christians.

(Parker and Co., 1889.)

Church Quarterly Review, *April,* 1890.—"The Apology is, in man of the best works for enabling the theological student to appreciate t position of Christians at the end of the second century; but its diffi it almost impossible for many even to translate, much less understand therefore, no book which more needs a careful and simple commentary an We have not read through the whole of the translation, but we ha whenever we have done so, perfectly correct, perfectly clear, and wr English language."

Morning Post, *April 8th,* 1890.—"The task of translation has been m and creditably performed. The analysis and notes will be found spe to candidates for Ordination."

National Church, *February,* 1890.—"An admirable rendering, in m English, of one of the most valuable works of the early Christian Apolog

John Bull, *January 25th,* 1890.—"The translation is the work of scholar."

ET INCARNATUS EST.

(James Pott and Co., 1896.)

Guardian, *February 12th,* 1896.—"It is a pleasure to call attention theology of these three meditative addresses."

THE CREEDS:

FOUR ADDRESSES.

(S. P. C. K., 1896.)

Guardian, *March 11th,* 1896.—"Mr. Bindley's addresses follow t method, and show the same signs of theological ability as appeared of 'Et Incarnatus Est,' which we recently noticed. The subject of here treated with such evident interest that we should like to see a large same from Mr. Bindley."

Church Times, *April 24th,* 1896.—"We can strongly recommend this li

Foreign Church Chronicle, *March,* 1898.—"Mr. Bindley has given u valuable manual on Creeds in general, and on each of the Three Creeds s

DATE DUE

HIGHSMITH #LO-45220

BT 990 .O4 1899

The Oecumenical documents of
the faith

B5 A

37188

GENERAL ... SEMINARY
NEW YORK

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00015237